arXiv:1110.0804v1 [math.PR] 4 Oct 2011

Simultaneous Large Deviations for the Shape of Young Diagrams Associated With Random Words

Christian Houdré [*] Jinyong Ma [†]

October 5, 2011

Abstract

We investigate the large deviations of the shape of the random RSK Young tableaux associated with a random word of size n whose letters are independently drawn from an alphabet of size $m = m(n)$. When the letters are drawn uniformly and when both n and m converge together to infinity, m not growing too fast with respect to n, the large deviations of the shape of the Young tableaux are shown to be the same as that of the spectrum of the traceless GUE. In the non-uniform case, a control of both highest probabilities will ensure that the length of the top row of the tableau satisfies a large deviation principle. In either case, both speeds and rate functions are identified. To complete our study, non-asymptotic concentration bounds for the length of the top row of the tableaux, *i.e.*, for the length of the longest increasing subsequence of the random word are also given for both models.

AMS 2000 Subject Classification: 15A52, 60B12, 60C05, 60F10, 60F15, 60G15

Keywords: Large deviations, Random matrices, Random words, Longest increasing subsequence, Strong approximation, Young tableaux.

1 Introduction and results

Let $\mathcal{A}_m = \{\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \cdots < \alpha_m\}$ be an ordered alphabet of size m, and let a word be made of the random letters $X_1^m, X_2^m, \cdots, X_n^m$, independently drawn from $\mathcal{A}_m$. The Robinson-Schensted-Knuth (RSK) correspondence associates to this random word a pair of Young tableaux, of the same shape, having at most m rows. Now for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, let $R_i(n, m)$ denote the length of the ith

---

[*] Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Mathematics, Atlanta, Georgia, 30332-0160, houdre@math.gatech.edu. Research supported in part by the NSA grant H98230-09-1-0017.

[†] Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Mathematics, Atlanta, Georgia, 30332-0160, jma@math.gatech.edu

row of the Young tableaux, and recall that $R_1(n,m)$, the length of the top row, coincides with the length of the longest increasing subsequence of the random word $X_1^m X_2^m \cdots X_n^m$. Appropriately renormalized and for uniform draws, the shape $(R_i(n,m))_{i=1}^m$ of the Young tableaux converges, in law, to the spectrum of an $m \times m$ element of the traceless GUE ([19], [30]). In turn, any fixed size subset of this spectrum, also converges with m, and after proper renormalization, to a multidimensional Tracy-Widom distribution ([29], [31]). These asymptotics have further led (see [9]) to the study of the limiting shape of these Young tableaux when the word length and alphabet size simultaneously grow to infinity. This is briefly recalled next.

Let the random matrix $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_{ij})_{1 \le i,j \le m}$ be an element of the $m \times m$ GUE with rescaling such that $Re(\mathbf{X}_{ij}) \sim N(0,1/2)$ and $Im(\mathbf{X}_{ij}) \sim N(0,1/2)$, for $i \neq j$; and $\mathbf{X}_{ii} \sim N(0,1)$ (see [3] and [24] for background on random matrices). Let $(\lambda_1^m, \lambda_2^m, \cdots, \lambda_m^m)$ be the nonincreasing ordered spectrum of $\mathbf{X}$, and let $(\lambda_1^{m,0}, \lambda_2^{m,0}, \cdots, \lambda_m^{m,0})$ be the corresponding ordered spectrum of an element of the traceless GUE (that is of $\mathbf{X} - tr(\mathbf{X})/m$). An important fact (*e.g.* [5], [13], [15]) asserts that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\lambda_1^{m,0}, \lambda_2^{m,0}, \cdots, \lambda_m^{m,0}\right)\\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \frac{\sqrt{m-1}}{\sqrt{m}} \mathbf{\Theta}_m^{-1} \left(\left(\max_{\mathbf{t} \in I_{k,m}} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{l=j}^{m-k+j} \left(\tilde{B}^l_{t_{j,l}} - \tilde{B}^l_{t_{j,l-1}} \right) \right)_{1 \le k \le m} \right), \qquad (1.1)\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{\Theta}_m : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is defined via $(\mathbf{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{x}))_j = \sum_{i=1}^j x_i, 1 \le j \le k$, and where $(\tilde{B}^j)_{1 \le j \le m}$ is a driftless m-dimensional Brownian Motion with covariance matrix

$$t \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho & \cdots & \rho \\ \rho & 1 & \cdots & \rho \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho & \rho & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (1.2)$$

with $\rho = -1/(m-1)$, and where for $1 \le k \le m$,

$$\begin{aligned}I_{k,m} = \{&\mathbf{t} = (t_{j,l} : 1 \le j \le k, 0 \le l \le m) : t_{j,j-1} = 0, t_{j,m-k+j} = 1, 1 \le j \le k,\\ &t_{j,l-1} \le t_{j,l}, 1 \le j \le k, 1 \le l \le m-1; t_{j,l} \le t_{j-1,l-1}, 2 \le j \le k, 2 \le l \le m\}.\end{aligned}$$

By comparing the Brownian functionals in (1.1) with discrete functionals representing the shape of the Young tableaux, and via a KMT approximation, the simultaneous asymptotic convergence of the shape of the random RSK Young tableaux is obtained in [9].

A related strategy is pursued here in order to investigate the large deviations of the shape of the RSK Young tableaux. More precisely, we obtain a large deviation principle for the length of the first r rows of the Young tableaux, when n and m simultaneously converge to infinity and when the size m of the alphabet does not grow too fast. To achieve our goals, we also rely on the techniques and results developed in [6] (see also [2]), where large deviations are obtained for the largest (or the rth largest) eigenvalue of the GOE. These methodologies further give the multidimensional large deviations for the first r eigenvalues of the ordered spectrum of the traceless GUE. In turn, combined with a KMT approximation, these lead to large deviations for the shape of the tableaux.

Let us put our work into context. For random permutations, the large deviations of the length of the longest increasing subsequence are described in [12] and [28], while, moderate deviations are given in [22] and [23]. Closer to our framework, in [17], following the comparison method of [4] and [8], large deviations for the last-passage directed percolation model close to the x-axis are established for *iid* Gaussian or bounded weights. The length of the top row of the tableaux also corresponds to a last-passage percolation, but with *dependent* (exchangeable in the uniform case) Bernoulli weights (see (2.3)). In our framework, we also take care of the other rows of the tableaux.

Here is the first result of our work,

Theorem 1.1 *In the uniform case, let m and n simultaneously converge to infinity in such a way that $m(n) = o(n^{1/4})$. Then, for any $r \geq 1$,*

$$\Big(\frac{R_1(n, m(n)) - n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}}, \cdots, \frac{R_r(n, m(n)) - n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)$$

satisfies a large deviation principle with speed $m(n)$ and good rate function I_r on the space $\mathcal{L}^r := \{(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_r) \in \mathbb{R}^r : x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \cdots \geq x_r\}$, where

$$I_r(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_r) = \begin{cases} 2\sum_{i=1}^r \int_2^{x_i} \sqrt{(z/2)^2 - 1}dz, & \textit{if } \ x_1 \geq x_2 \cdots \geq x_r \geq 2, \\ +\infty, & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

In other words, for all $x_1 \geq x_2 \cdots \geq x_r \geq 2$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\Big(\frac{R_1(n, m(n)) - n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \geq x_1, \cdots, \frac{R_r(n, m(n)) - n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \geq x_r\Big) = -2\sum_{i=1}^r \int_2^{x_i} \sqrt{(z/2)^2 - 1}dz, \tag{1.4}$$

while for any $x < 2$ and $1 \leq i \leq r$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{R_i(n, m(n)) - n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \leq x\right) = -\infty. \tag{1.5}$$

Remark 1.1 *The rate function I_r in* (1.3) *is a good rate function. Moreover it is continuous and increasing with respect to each individual variable on its effective domain $\mathcal{D}_{I_r} = \{(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_r) \in \mathbb{R}^r : x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \cdots \geq x_r \geq 2\}$, given that the other variables are fixed. Thus, when proving the large deviation principle (LDP) as in Theorem 1.1, instead of proving both the usual upper and* *lower bounds, i.e., that for any closed set F in $\mathcal{L}^r = \{(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_r) \in \mathbb{R}^r : x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \cdots \geq x_r\}$,*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\left(X_r^n \in F\right) \leq -\inf_F I_r, \tag{1.6}$$

and that for any open set O in $\mathcal{L}^r$,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\left(X_r^n \in O\right) \geq -\inf_O I_r, \tag{1.7}$$

where

$$X_r^n = \left(\frac{R_i(n, m(n)) - n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\right)_{1\leq i\leq r},$$

it is enough to prove a limiting equality on rectangular subsets as in (1.5) *and* (1.4).

In Theorem 1.1, if at least one of the renormalized variables is on the left of its simultaneous asymptotic mean, by changing the convergence speed from m to m^2, a more accurate form of (1.5) is valid. The closed form expression obtained for K below was found after Satya Majumdar kindly suggested that the methodology developed in [25] would apply to our traceless GUE framework.

Theorem 1.2 *In the uniform case, let m and n simultaneously converge to infinity in such a way that $m(n) = o(n^{1/6})$. Then, for any $r \geq 1$,*

$$\left(\frac{R_1(n, m(n)) - n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}}, \cdots, \frac{R_r(n, m(n)) - n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

satisfies a large deviation principle with speed $(m(n))^2$ and good rate function $K(x_r)$ on the space $\mathcal{L}^r := \{(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_r) \in \mathbb{R}^r : x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \cdots \geq x_r\}$, where K is the rate function of the largest eigenvalue of the $m \times m$ traceless GUE, when on the left of its asymptotic mean. It is given by

$$K(x) := \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0((-\infty, x])} I(\mu), \tag{1.8}$$

where I (see (A.5)*) is the rate function for the LDP of the spectral measure of the GUE, and $\mathcal{M}_0((-\infty, x])$ is the set of zero mean probability measures supported on $(-\infty, x]$. For $x \leq 0$, $K(x) = +\infty$, for $x \geq 2$, $K(x) = 0$, and for*

$0 < x < 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&K(x) = \frac{1}{48}\Bigg(3\left(9\sqrt[3]{2}3^{2/3}\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12}-9x\right)^{2/3}-8\right)x^2+\\
&9\sqrt[3]{2}\sqrt[6]{3}\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12}-9x\right)^{1/3}\left(\sqrt{27x^2+4}\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12}-9x\right)^{1/3}-5\sqrt[3]{2}\sqrt[6]{3}\right)x-\\
&6\sqrt[3]{2}3^{2/3}\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12}-9x\right)^{2/3}-3\,2^{2/3}3^{5/6}\sqrt{27x^2+4}\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12}-9x\right)^{1/3}+\\
&\quad 16\log\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12}-9x\right)-48\log\left(2\sqrt[3]{3}-\sqrt[3]{2}\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12}-9x\right)^{2/3}\right)+\\
&\hfill 60+32\log 6\Bigg). \qquad (1.9)
\end{aligned}$$

In other words, for all $x_r \le x_{r-1} \le \cdots \le x_1$*, with* $x_r \le 2$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{(m(n))^2}\log\mathbb{P}\Bigg(\frac{R_1(n,m(n))-n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\le x_1,\cdots,\frac{R_r(n,m(n))-n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\le x_r\Bigg) = -K(x_r), \quad (1.10)$$

while for all $2 \le x_r \le x_{r-1} \le \cdots \le x_1$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{(m(n))^2}\log\mathbb{P}\Bigg(\frac{R_1(n,m(n))-n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\le x_1,\cdots,\frac{R_r(n,m(n))-n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\le x_r\Bigg) = 0. \quad (1.11)$$

The LDP for the longest increasing subsequence is now a simple consequence:

Corollary 1.1 *Let* m *and* n *simultaneously converge to infinity in such a way that* $m(n) = o(n^{1/4})$*, then for any* $x \ge 2$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{m(n)}\log\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{R_1(n,m(n))-n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\ge x\right) = -2\int_2^x\sqrt{(z/2)^2-1}\,dz,$$

and similarly, if $m(n) = o(n^{1/6})$*, for any* $x \le 2$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{(m(n))^2}\log\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{R_1(n,m(n))-n/m(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\le x\right) = -K(x).$$

Remark 1.2 *The methodologies developed in this paper also allow to derive LDPs in related problems. Such is the case for last-passage directed percolation close to the x-axis, or for the departure time from many queues in series when the number of customers is a fractional power of the number of servers. In these two problems, similar discrete functional representations are available but with iid weights, so the large deviations rate functions should be the corresponding rate functions of the largest eigenvalue of the GUE.*

When the independent random letters are no longer uniformly drawn, let the $X_i^m, 1 \leq i \leq n$, be independently and identically distributed with $\mathbb{P}(X_1^m = \alpha_j) = p_j^m$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. Moreover, let $p_{max}^m = \max_{1\leq j \leq m} p_j^m$, let $p_{2nd}^m = \max\{p_j^m < p_{max}^m : 1 \leq j \leq m\}$, and let also $J(m) = \{j : p_j^m = p_{max}^m\}$, with $k(m) = card(J(m))$, *i.e.*, $k(m)$ is the multiplicity of p_{max}^m.

Theorem 1.3 *In the nonuniform case, let $k(m(n))$ and n simultaneously converge to infinity in such a way that $k(m(n))^3/p_{max}^m = o(n)$. Let also*

$$\frac{n(p_{2nd}^m)^2}{p_{max}^m} = o(\exp(-k(m(n))^\alpha)), \quad \textit{for some} \;\; \alpha > 1, \tag{1.12}$$

then

$$\frac{R_1(n, m(n)) - np_{max}^m}{\sqrt{nk(m(n))p_{max}^m}}$$

satisfies a LDP on $\mathbb{R}$ with speed $k(m(n))$ and good rate function I_1.

In other words, for any $x \geq 2$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{k(m(n))} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{R_1(n, m(n)) - np_{max}^m}{\sqrt{nk(m(n))p_{max}^m}} \geq x\right) = -2\int_2^x \sqrt{(z/2)^2 - 1}dz, \tag{1.13}$$

while for any $x < 2$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{k(m(n))} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{R_1(n, m(n)) - np_{max}^m}{\sqrt{nk(m(n))p_{max}^m}} \leq x\right) = -\infty. \tag{1.14}$$

Above, the conditions on p_{max}^m match exactly those of Theorem 1.1.

When the renormalized variable is on the left of its simultaneous asymptotic mean, again we get a more accurate form of (1.14). Before presenting this result, let us first recall a few facts. For the alphabet $\mathcal{A}_m$ with corresponding probability set $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1^m, p_2^m, \cdots, p_m^m\}$, let $p^{(1)} > p^{(2)} > \cdots > p^{(l)}$, $1 \leq l \leq m$, be the distinct elements in $\mathcal{P}$, and let $d_1, \cdots, d_l$ be the corresponding multiplicities, with $\sum_{i=1}^l d_i = m$. Then $p^{(1)} = p_{max}^m$ and $d_1 = k(m)$ as in the previous notations. Let $\mathcal{G}_m(d_1, \cdots, d_l)$ be the set of $m \times m$ random matrices $\mathbf{X}$ which are direct sums of mutually independent elements of the $d_i \times d_i$ GUE, $1 \leq i \leq l$. Moreover, let $p_{(1)} \geq p_{(2)} \geq \cdots \geq p_{(m)}$ be the non-increasing rearrangement of $\mathcal{P}$. The "generalized" $m \times m$ traceless GUE associated with $\mathcal{P}$ is the set, denoted by $\mathcal{G}^0(p_1^m, p_2^m, \cdots, p_m^m)$, of $m \times m$ random matrices $\mathbf{X^0}$, of the form

$$\mathbf{X}_{i,j}^0 = \begin{cases} \mathbf{X}_{i,i} - \sqrt{p_{(i)}} \sum_{h=1}^m \sqrt{p_{(h)}} \mathbf{X}_{h,h}, & \text{if } i = j, \\ \mathbf{X}_{i,j}, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{1.15}$$

where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{G}_m(d_1, \cdots, d_l)$. Let $\tilde{\lambda}_1^0$ be the largest eigenvalue of the diagonal block corresponding to $p^{(1)} = p_{max}^m$ in $\mathbf{X^0}$.

Theorem 1.4 *Let $k(m(n))$ and n simultaneously converge to infinity in such a way that $k(m(n))^5/p^m_{max} = o(n)$, let*

$$\frac{n(p^m_{2nd})^2}{p^m_{max}} = o(\exp(-k(m(n))^\alpha)), \quad \text{for some} \quad \alpha > 2, \tag{1.16}$$

and assume that for some $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} k(m(n))p^m_{max} = \eta. \tag{1.17}$$

Then

$$\frac{R_1(n, m(n)) - np^m_{max}}{\sqrt{nk(m(n))p^m_{max}}}$$

satisfies a LDP on $\mathbb{R}$ with speed $(k(m(n)))^2$ and good rate function K_η, where K_η is the rate function of $\tilde{\lambda}^0_1$ when on the left of its asymptotic mean.

In other words, for any $x \leq 2$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{(k(m(n)))^2} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{R_1(n, m(n)) - np^m_{max}}{\sqrt{nk(m(n))p^m_{max}}} \leq x \right) = -K_\eta(x), \tag{1.18}$$

while for any $x \geq 2$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{(k(m(n)))^2} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{R_1(n, m(n)) - np^m_{max}}{\sqrt{nk(m(n))p^m_{max}}} \leq x \right) = 0. \tag{1.19}$$

Remark 1.3 *The rate function K_η is given by*

$$K_\eta(x) = \sup_{y\leq 0} \left(xy - yS(y) + J(S(y)) + \frac{\eta y^2}{2} \right),$$

where J is the rate function (with speed m^2) of the largest eigenvalue of the $m \times m$ GUE, and for each $y \leq 0$, $S(y)$ is the unique solution to $J'(t) = y$ with $t \leq 2$. For $x \geq 2$, $J(x) = 0$, while for $x \leq 2$, the following closed form expression for J is obtained in [10],

$$\begin{aligned} J(x) = \frac{1}{216}\Bigg(&- x\left(-72x + x^3 + 30\sqrt{12+x^2} + x^2\sqrt{12+x^2}\right) \\ &- 216 \log\left(\frac{1}{6}\left(x + \sqrt{12+x^2}\right)\right)\Bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{1.20}$$

In particular, $K_0 = J$ and $K_1 = K$. For any $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $K_\eta(x) = 0$, when $x \geq 2$. For $0 \leq \eta < 1$ and $x \in (-\infty, 2)$, $K_\eta(x) > 0$ and is asymptotically equivalent to

$$\frac{x^2}{2(1-\eta)} + \log\left(-\frac{x}{1-\eta}\right),$$

as $x \to -\infty$. For $\eta = 1$, when $0 < x < 2$, $K_1(x) = K(x)$ is positive and finite, asymptotically equivalent to $-\log x$, as $x \to 0$.

To complement the previous results, we provide corresponding concentration results. These rely in part on the concentration results for the largest eigenvalue of the $m \times m$ GUE matrix, obtained respectively in [1] and [20]. Comparing the forthcoming result with Corollary 1.1, we see that the deviation rates match the fluctuation results in this case. In turn these rates match the order of the tails of the Tracy-Widom distribution.

Theorem 1.5 *In the uniform model, let* $0 < \alpha < 1/4$*, and let* $m \leq An^{\alpha}$*, for some* $A > 0$*. Then for any* $0 < \epsilon < 1$*,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{R_1(n,m) - n/m}{\sqrt{n/m}} \geq 2\sqrt{m}(1+\epsilon)\right) \leq C(A,\alpha)\exp\left\{-\frac{m\epsilon^{3/2}}{C(A,\alpha)}\right\}, \tag{1.21}$$

where

$$C(A,\alpha) = C\max\{A^{10/3},1\}\frac{1+\alpha}{1-4\alpha}\exp\left\{\frac{1+\alpha}{1-4\alpha}\right\},$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$*.*

Likewise, let $0 < \alpha < 1/6$*, and let* $m \leq An^{\alpha}$*, for some* $A > 0$*. Then for any* $0 < \epsilon < 1$*,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{R_1(n,m) - n/m}{\sqrt{n/m}} \leq 2\sqrt{m}(1-\epsilon)\right) \leq C(A,\alpha)\exp\left\{-\frac{m^2\epsilon^{3}}{C(A,\alpha)}\right\}, \tag{1.22}$$

where

$$C(A,\alpha) = C\max\{A^{4},1\}\frac{1+\alpha}{1-6\alpha}\exp\left\{\frac{1+\alpha}{1-6\alpha}\right\},$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$*.*

Again, in the non-uniform case, we have similar results but under a further control of the second highest probability.

Theorem 1.6 *In the non-uniform model, let* $\alpha > 3$*, and let* $k(m(n))^{\alpha}/p^m_{max} \leq An$*, for some* $A > 0$*. Moreover, let*

$$\frac{n(p^m_{2nd})^2}{p^m_{max}} \leq B\exp(-k(m(n))), \tag{1.23}$$

for some $B > 0$*, then for any* $0 < \epsilon < 1$*,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{R_1(n,m) - np^m_{max}}{\sqrt{nk(m)p^m_{max}}} \geq 2(1+\epsilon)\right) \leq C(A,B,\alpha)\exp\left\{-\frac{k(m)\epsilon^{3/2}}{C(A,B,\alpha)}\right\}, \tag{1.24}$$

where

$$C(A,B,\alpha) = C\max\{A^{10/3\alpha},1\}\max\{\sqrt{B},1\}\frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha-3}\exp\left\{\frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha-3}\right\},$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$*.*

Likewise, let $\alpha > 5$ *and let* $k(m(n))^\alpha / p^m_{max} \leq An$*, with some* $A > 0$*, and let*

$$\frac{n(p^m_{2nd})^2}{p^m_{max}} \leq B \exp(-k(m(n))^2), \tag{1.25}$$

for some $B > 0$*, then for any* $0 < \epsilon < 1$*,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{R_1(n,m) - np^m_{max}}{\sqrt{nk(m)p^m_{max}}} \leq 2(1-\epsilon)\right) \leq C(A,B,\alpha)\exp\left\{-\frac{k(m)^2\epsilon^3}{C(A,B,\alpha)}\right\}, \tag{1.26}$$

where

$$C(A,B,\alpha) = C\max\{A^{4/\alpha}, 1\}\max\{\sqrt{B}, 1\}\frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha-5}\exp\left\{\frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha-5}\right\},$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$*.*

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2

As in [9], let

$$X^m_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } X^m_i = \alpha_j, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

be Bernoulli random variables with parameter $1/m$. For a fixed $1 \leq j \leq m$, the $X^m_{i,j}$s are iid while for $j \neq j'$, $(X^m_{1,j}, \cdots, X^m_{n,j})$ and $(X^m_{1,j'}, \cdots, X^m_{n,j'})$ are identically distributed but no longer independent.

Let $S^{m,j}_k = \sum_{i=1}^k X^m_{i,j}$ be the number of occurences of α_j among $(X^m_i)_{1\leq i\leq k}$. Since for $1 \leq k < l \leq n$, the number of occurences of α_j among $(X^m_i)_{k+1\leq i\leq l}$ is $S^{m,j}_l - S^{m,j}_k$,

$$R_1(n,m) = \sup_{0=l_0\leq l_1\leq\cdots\leq l_m=n} \sum_{j=1}^m (S^{m,j}_{l_j} - S^{m,j}_{l_{j-1}}),$$

with the convention that $S^{m,j}_0 = 0$.

Moreover, letting $V_k(n,m) = \sum_{i=1}^k R_i(n,m)$, combinatorial arguments yield (see Theorem 3.1 in [15])

$$V_k(n,m) = \sup_{\mathbf{t}\in I_{k,m}(n)} \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{l=j}^{m-k+j} \left(S^{m,l}_{[t_{j,l}]} - S^{m,l}_{[t_{j,l-1}]}\right), \quad 1 \leq k \leq m, \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{k,m}(n) = \{\mathbf{t} = (t_{j,l} : 1 \leq j \leq k, 0 \leq l \leq m) :& \\ t_{j,j-1} = 0, t_{j,m-k+j} = n, 1 \leq j \leq k; t_{j,l-1} \leq t_{j,l}, 1 \leq j \leq k, 1 \leq l \leq m-1;& \\ t_{j,l} \leq t_{j-1,l-1}, 2 \leq j \leq k, 2 \leq l \leq m\}.& \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{X}^m_{i,j} = (X^m_{i,j} - 1/m)/\sigma_m$, with $\sigma^2_m = (1/m)(1-1/m)$, let $\tilde{S}^{m,j}_k = \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{X}^m_{i,j}$. Similarly define $\tilde{V}_k(n,m),\ 1 \le k \le m$ and let $\tilde{R}_k(n,m) = \tilde{V}_k(n,m) - \tilde{V}_{k-1}(n,m)$, $2 \le k \le m$, while $\tilde{R}_1(n,m) = \tilde{V}_1(n,m)$. Clearly $V_k(n,m) = \sigma_m \tilde{V}_k(n,m) + kn/m$, and

$$\frac{R_k(n,m) - n/m}{\sqrt{n}} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{m}}\,\frac{\tilde{R}_k(n,m)}{\sqrt{nm}}.$$

Let

$$\tilde{V}_k(n,m) = \sup_{\mathbf{t} \in I_{k,m}(n)} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{l=j}^{m-k+j} \left(\tilde{S}^{m,l}_{[t_{j,l}]} - \tilde{S}^{m,l}_{[t_{j,l-1}]} \right), \qquad 1 \le k \le m, \tag{2.3}$$

with

$$Cov(\tilde{S}^{m,i}_k, \tilde{S}^{m,j}_k) = \begin{cases} k, & \text{if } i = j, \\ k\rho, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

and $\rho = -1/(m-1)$.

Next, $\tilde{V}_k(n,m)$ can be approximated by

$$\tilde{L}_k(n,m) = \sup_{\mathbf{t} \in I_{k,m}(n)} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{l=j}^{m-k+j} \left(\tilde{B}^l_{t_{j,l}} - \tilde{B}^l_{t_{j,l-1}} \right), \qquad 1 \le k \le m, \tag{2.5}$$

where $(\tilde{B}^j)_{1 \le j \le m}$ is a driftless m-dimensional Brownian Motion with covariance matrix given in (1.2), and

$$\tilde{L}_k(n,m) \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \sqrt{n}\tilde{L}_k(1,m).$$

More precisely, inspired by [8],

$$|\tilde{V}_k(n,m) - \tilde{L}_k(n,m)| \le 2k \sum_{l=1}^{m} (Y^{m,l}_n + W^l_n), \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$Y^{m,l}_n = \max_{1 \le i \le n} |\tilde{S}^{m,l}_i - \tilde{B}^l_i| \quad \text{and} \quad W^l_n = \sup_{\substack{0 \le s,t \le n \\ |s-t| \le 1}} |\tilde{B}^l_s - \tilde{B}^l_t|.$$

Since

$$\left(\tilde{R}_k(n,m)\right)_{1 \le i \le m} = \mathbf{\Theta}^{-1}_m \left(\left(\tilde{V}_k(n,m)\right)_{1 \le k \le m} \right),$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$, and from (2.6),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde{R}_k(n,m) - \left(\tilde{L}_k(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{k-1}(n,m)\right)\right| \geq \sqrt{mn}\epsilon\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(2(2k-1)\sum_{l=1}^{m}(Y_n^{m,l} + W_n^l) \geq \sqrt{mn}\epsilon\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{m} Y_n^{m,l} \geq \frac{\sqrt{mn}\epsilon}{4(2k-1)}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{m} W_n^l \geq \frac{\sqrt{mn}\epsilon}{4(2k-1)}\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{l=1}^{m}\left(\mathbb{P}\left(Y_n^{m,l} \geq \frac{\sqrt{mn}\epsilon}{m(8k-4)}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(W_n^l \geq \frac{\sqrt{mn}\epsilon}{m(8k-4)}\right)\right) \\
&= m\mathbb{P}\left(Y_n^{m,1} \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}(8k-4)}\right) + m\mathbb{P}\left(W_n^1 \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}(8k-4)}\right), \qquad (2.7)
\end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq k \leq m$, and with the convention that $\tilde{L}_0(n,m) = 0$.

From Sakhanenko's version of the KMT inequality as stated, for example, in Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 3.2 of [21],

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Y_n^{m,1} \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}(8k-4)}\right) \leq (1+c_2(m)\sqrt{n})\exp\left\{-c_1(m)\frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}(8k-4)}\right\}, \quad (2.8)$$

where, as $m \to +\infty$, $c_1(m) \sim C_1/\sqrt{m}$ and $c_2(m) \sim C_2/\sqrt{m}$, for absolute constants C_1 and C_2. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(W_n^1 \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}(8k-4)}\right) &\leq 2n\mathbb{P}\left(|\tilde{B}_2^1| \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}(16k-8)}\right) \\
&= 4n\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{B}_2^1 \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{\sqrt{m}(16k-8)}\right) \\
&\leq 4en\exp\left\{-\frac{n\epsilon^2}{4em(16k-8)^2}\right\}. \qquad (2.9)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.8) and (2.9), under the condition $m(n) = o(n^{1/4})$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde{R}_k(n,m) - \left(\tilde{L}_k(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{k-1}(n,m)\right)\right| \geq \sqrt{mn}\epsilon\right) \leq C_3\sqrt{mn}\exp\left\{-\frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{C_3 m}\right\}, \quad (2.10)$$

for $1 \leq k \leq r$, and where C_3 is a positive constant depending on k, which for r fixed, can be chosen only depending on r.

For any $x_1 \geq x_2 \cdots \geq x_r > 2$, $r \geq 1$, and $0 < \epsilon < (x_r - 2)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq x_1, \frac{\tilde{R}_2(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq x_2, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq x_r\right) \qquad (2.11)\\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m) - \tilde{L}_0(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq x_1 - \epsilon, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{L}_r(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{r-1}(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq x_r - \epsilon\right)\\
&\qquad + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_i(n,m) - (\tilde{L}_i(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{i-1}(n,m))}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq \epsilon\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq x_1, \frac{\tilde{R}_2(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq x_2, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq x_r\right) \qquad (2.12)\\
&\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m) - \tilde{L}_0(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq x_1 + \epsilon, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{L}_r(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{r-1}(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq x_r + \epsilon\right)\\
&\qquad - \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{(\tilde{L}_i(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{i-1}(n,m)) - \tilde{R}_i(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq \epsilon\right),
\end{aligned}$$

with again the convention that $\tilde{L}_0(n,m) = 0$.

Combining (1.1) with Theorem A.1 of the Appendix, when m and n simultaneously converge to infinity in such a way that $m(n) = o(n^{1/4})$, the large deviations for $(\tilde{L}_k(n,m))_{1 \leq k \leq r}$ are then given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \geq x_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{L}_r(n,m(n)) - \tilde{L}_{r-1}(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \geq x_r\right)\\
&\qquad = -2\sum_{i=1}^{r} \int_2^{x_i} \sqrt{(z/2)^2 - 1}\,dz, \quad (2.13)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \cdots \geq x_r > 2$. This implies that,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \geq x_1 \pm \epsilon, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{L}_r(n,m(n)) - \tilde{L}_{r-1}(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \geq x_r \pm \epsilon\right)\\
&= \exp\left\{-m(n)\left(I_r(x_1 \pm \epsilon, \cdots, x_r \pm \epsilon) + o(1)\right)\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $o(1)$ goes to 0 as n converges to infinity. Combining this fact with (2.10), for any $1 \le k \le r$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde{R}_k(n,m) - \left(\tilde{L}_k(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{k-1}(n,m)\right)\right| \ge \sqrt{mn}\epsilon\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{L}_1(n,m) \ge \sqrt{mn}(x_1 \pm \epsilon), \cdots, \tilde{L}_r(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{r-1}(n,m) \ge \sqrt{mn}(x_r \pm \epsilon)\right)} \\
&\le C_3\sqrt{mn}\exp\left\{-\frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{C_3 m} + m(I_r(x_1 \pm \epsilon, \cdots, x_r \pm \epsilon) + o(1))\right\} \\
&= C_3\sqrt{mn}\exp\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}}{m}\left(-\frac{\epsilon}{C_3} + \frac{m^2}{\sqrt{n}}\left(I_r(x_1 \pm \epsilon, \cdots, x_r \pm \epsilon) + o(1)\right)\right)\right\} \\
&\to 0 \qquad \text{as } m, n \to \infty, \quad m = o(n^{1/4}). \qquad (2.14)
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.11) and (2.14), as m and n simultaneously converge to infinity with $m = o(n^{1/4})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \ge x_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \ge x_r\right) \qquad (2.15) \\
&\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log 2\mathbb{P}\Bigg(\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \ge x_1 - \epsilon, \cdots, \\
&\qquad\qquad \frac{\tilde{L}_r(n,m(n)) - \tilde{L}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \ge x_r - \epsilon\Bigg) \\
&= -I_r(x_1 - \epsilon, \cdots, x_r - \epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Likewise, from (2.12) and (2.14),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \ge x_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \ge x_r\right) \qquad (2.16) \\
&\ge \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}\Bigg(\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \ge x_1 + \epsilon, \cdots, \\
&\qquad\qquad \frac{\tilde{L}_r(n,m(n)) - \tilde{L}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \ge x_r + \epsilon\Bigg) \\
&= -I_r(x_1 + \epsilon, \cdots, x_r + \epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Now letting $\epsilon \to 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \ge x_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \ge x_r\right) \\
&= -2\sum_{i=1}^{r} \int_2^{x_i} \sqrt{(z/2)^2 - 1}\,dz,
\end{aligned}$$

for any $x_1 \ge x_2 \cdots \ge x_r > 2$. Next, assume that $x_1 \ge x_2 \cdots \ge x_k > x_{k+1} = \cdots = x_r = 2$, $1 \le k \le r$, with the convention that $k = r$ corresponds to

$x_1 \geq x_2 \cdots \geq x_r > 2$. Under the conditions given in Theorem 1.1, for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \geq x_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \geq x_r\right) \\
&\geq -2\sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_2^{x_i} \sqrt{(z/2)^2-1}dz - 2\sum_{i=k+1}^{r} \int_2^{2+\epsilon} \sqrt{(z/2)^2-1}dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\epsilon \to 0$, gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \geq x_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \geq x_r\right) \\
&\geq -2\sum_{i=1}^{r} \int_2^{x_i} \sqrt{(z/2)^2-1}dz, \qquad (2.17)
\end{aligned}$$

while,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \geq x_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \geq x_r\right) \\
&\leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \geq x_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_k(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \geq x_k\right) \\
&= -2\sum_{i=1}^{r} \int_2^{x_i} \sqrt{(z/2)^2-1}dz. \qquad (2.18)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.17) and (2.18), (1.4) is proved.

Now fix $x < 2$, let $0 < \epsilon < (2-x)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_k(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \leq x\right) \leq{}& \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{L}_k(n,m)-\tilde{L}_{k-1}(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \leq x+\epsilon\right) \\
&+ \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|\tilde{R}_k(n,m)-(\tilde{L}_k(n,m)-\tilde{L}_{k-1}(n,m))|}{\sqrt{mn}} \geq \epsilon\right), \qquad (2.19)
\end{aligned}$$

for any $1 \leq k \leq r$. From (2.24), the first term on the right of (2.19) is exponentially negligible with speed m. For the second term, from (2.10), for any $T > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde{R}_k(n,m) - \left(\tilde{L}_k(n,m)-\tilde{L}_{k-1}(n,m)\right)\right| \geq \sqrt{mn}\epsilon\right) e^{mT} \qquad (2.20) \\
&\leq C_3\sqrt{mn}\exp\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}}{m}\left(-\frac{\epsilon}{C_3}+\frac{m^2T}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right\} \to 0 \qquad \text{as } m,n\to\infty, \quad m = o(n^{1/4}).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, letting $T \to \infty$, we obtain that, for any $x < 2$ and $1 \le k \le r$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_k(n, m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le x \right) = -\infty, \tag{2.21}$$

which proves (1.5) in Theorem 1.1. ■

Proof of Theorem 1.2

First, (1.11) is just a direct consequence of (1.4). Next, we prove (1.10). Fix $y_1 \ge y_2 \ge \cdots \ge y_r$, with $y_r < 2$. If $K(y_r) < +\infty$, then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $K(y_r - \delta) < +\infty$ and such that for any $0 < \epsilon < \min\{\delta, 2 - y_r\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \le y_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \le y_r \right) \\ &\le \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m) - \tilde{L}_0(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \le y_1 + \epsilon, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{L}_r(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{r-1}(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \le y_r + \epsilon \right) \\ &\qquad + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|\tilde{R}_i(n,m) - (\tilde{L}_i(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{i-1}(n,m))|}{\sqrt{mn}} \ge \epsilon \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \le y_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \le y_r \right) \\ &\ge \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m) - \tilde{L}_0(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \le y_1 - \epsilon, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{L}_r(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{r-1}(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \le y_r - \epsilon \right) \\ &\qquad - \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|\tilde{R}_i(n,m) - (\tilde{L}_i(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{i-1}(n,m))|}{\sqrt{mn}} \ge \epsilon \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

with once more the convention that $\tilde{L}_0(n,m) = 0$.

Combining (1.1) with Corollary A.1, when m and n simultaneously converge to infinity with $m = o(n^{1/6})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)^2} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{L}_r(n,m(n)) - \tilde{L}_{r-1}(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_r \right) \\ = -K(y_r), \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

for all $y_r \le y_{r-1} \le \cdots \le y_1$ with $y_r < 2$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_1 \pm \epsilon, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{L}_r(n,m(n)) - \tilde{L}_{r-1}(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_r \pm \epsilon \right) \\ &\qquad = \exp\left\{ -m(n)^2 \left(K(y_r \pm \epsilon) + o(1) \right) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $o(1)$ is meant for an expression converging to zero as n converges to infinity. Combining this last fact with (2.10), for any $1 \le k \le r$

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde{R}_k(n,m) - \left(\tilde{L}_k(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{k-1}(n,m)\right)\right| \ge \sqrt{mn}\epsilon\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{L}_1(n,m) \le \sqrt{mn}(y_1 \pm \epsilon), \cdots, \tilde{L}_r(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{r-1}(n,m) \le \sqrt{mn}(y_r \pm \epsilon)\right)} \tag{2.25}$$

$$\le C_3\sqrt{mn}\exp\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}}{m}\left(-\frac{\epsilon}{C_3} + \frac{m^3}{\sqrt{n}}\left(K(y_r \pm \epsilon) + o(1)\right)\right)\right\}$$

$$\to 0 \qquad \text{as } m, n \to \infty, \quad m = o(n^{1/6}).$$

Repeating previous arguments, letting ϵ go to 0, and since $m = o(n^{1/6})$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)^2} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_r\right) = -K(y_r), \tag{2.26}$$

for $y_r \le y_{r-1} \le \cdots \le y_1$, with $y_r < 2$ and $K(y_r) < +\infty$.

Now for fixed $y_1 \ge y_2 \ge \cdots \ge y_r$, $y_r < 2$, we tackle the case $K(y_r) = +\infty$. Since

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \le y_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \le y_r\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \le y_r\right)$$

$$\le \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{L}_r(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{r-1}(n,m)}{\sqrt{mn}} \le y_r + \epsilon\right) +$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|\tilde{R}_r(n,m) - (\tilde{L}_r(n,m) - \tilde{L}_{r-1}(n,m))|}{\sqrt{mn}} \ge \epsilon\right), \tag{2.27}$$

and when m and n simultaneously converge to infinity with $m = o(n^{1/6})$, the second term on the right of (2.27) is exponentially negligible with speed m^2, while the first term is, from (2.24), dominated by $e^{-m(n)^2 K(y_r+\epsilon)}$. Thus (2.26), in this case, follows by letting ϵ go to 0.

Now let $2 = y_r \le y_{r-1} \le \cdots \le y_1$, then for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)^2} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_r\right)$$

$$\ge \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)^2} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le 2 - \epsilon\right)$$

$$= -K(2-\epsilon). \tag{2.28}$$

Again, letting ϵ goes to zero, and since K is continuous (see the Appendix for a proof), we get

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)^2} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_r\right) \ge -K(2) = 0.$$

Clearly,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{m(n)^2} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}_1(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_1, \cdots, \frac{\tilde{R}_r(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{m(n)n}} \le y_r \right) \le 0,$$

which proves the case $y_r = 2$, and finishes the proof of the first part of Theorem 1.2. From Lemma A.1 of the Appendix, we can prove (1.8).

When $x \le 0$, $\mathcal{M}_0((-\infty, x])$ is empty so $K(x) = +\infty$ and when $x \ge 2$, the semicircular probability measure belongs to $\mathcal{M}_0((-\infty, x])$, thus $K(x) = 0$. When $0 < x < 2$, the closed form expression of K given by (1.9) can be derived using the techniques developed in [25]. Denote by μ_0 the zero mean probability measure supported on $(-\infty, x]$, minimizing

$$I(\mu) = \frac{1}{2} \int y^2 d\mu(y) - \iint \log|t-y| d\mu(t) d\mu(y) - \frac{3}{4}, \tag{2.29}$$

(μ_0 will be explicitly found below, however, its existence and uniqueness also follows from Theorem 1.3 in Chapter 1 of [27]. Moreover, in view of Theorem 2.5 in Chapter IV of [27], μ_0 is absolutely continuous with continuous density ρ_0).

Consider the Lagrange function

$$E(\mu) = I(\mu) + c_1 \left(\int d\mu(y) - 1 \right) + c_2 \int y d\mu(y),$$

where the Lagrange multipliers c_1 and c_2 correspond to the constraints that μ is a zero mean probability measure. Taking the directional derivative of $E(\mu)$ with respect to ρ_0 gives

$$\frac{y^2}{2} - 2 \int \log|t-y| d\rho_0(t) + c_1 + c_2 y = 0. \tag{2.30}$$

In turn, differentiating (2.30) with respect to y further gives,

$$y - 2 \text{ p.v.} \int \frac{\rho_0(t)}{y-t} dt + c_2 = 0, \tag{2.31}$$

where p.v. denote the Cauchy principal value. Let $[L', x]$ be the support of μ_0 (that L' is finite will be shown below but this also follows from Theorem 1.10 or Theorem 1.11 of Chapter IV in [27]), then the finite Hilbert transform

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \text{p.v.} \int_{L'}^{x} \frac{\rho_0(t)}{y-t} dt = \frac{y + c_2}{2\pi}$$

becomes

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \text{p.v.} \int_{L}^{0} \frac{f_x(t)}{y-t} dt = \frac{x + y + c_2}{2\pi},$$

where $L = L' - x$ and $f_x(t) = \rho_0(t+x)$ is supported on $[L, 0]$. From Section 4.3 of [32], this finite Hilbert transform can be inverted as

$$f_x(y) = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{(y-L)(-y)}}\left(\text{p.v.}\int_L^0 \frac{\sqrt{(t-L)(-t)}}{t-y}\frac{x+t+c_2}{2\pi}dt + c_3\right), \quad (2.32)$$

where $L \leq y < 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{p.v.}\int_L^0 &\frac{\sqrt{(t-L)(-t)}}{t-y}\frac{x+t+c_2}{2\pi}dt \\ &= \frac{1}{16}\left(4c_2(L-2y) + L^2 + 4L(x+y) - 8y(x+y)\right). \quad (2.33)\end{aligned}$$

From $f_x(L) = 0$, we get

$$c_3 = \frac{1}{16}\left(4L(c_2+x) + 3L^2\right),$$

and plugging this into (2.32) yields

$$f_x(y) = \frac{\sqrt{y(L-y)}(2c_2 + L + 2(x+y))}{4\pi y}.$$

Now from the two constraints $\int d\mu_0(y) = 1$ and $\int y d\mu_0(y) = 0$ we get

$$\int_L^0 y f_x(y)dy + x = 0, \int_L^0 f_x(y)dy = 1,$$

which further gives

$$L = \frac{2\ 2^{2/3}\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12} - 9x\right)^{2/3} - 4\ 6^{1/3}}{3^{2/3}\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12} - 9x\right)^{1/3}}, \quad (2.34)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}c_2 = &\frac{2\ 3^{2/3} - \sqrt[3]{6}\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12} - 9x\right)^{2/3}}{2^{2/3}\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12} - 9x\right)^{1/3}} - \\ &\frac{\sqrt[3]{2}3^{2/3}\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12} - 9x\right)^{2/3} + \frac{6\ 2^{2/3}\sqrt[3]{3}}{\left(\sqrt{81x^2+12}-9x\right)^{2/3}} + 6}{18x} - x. \quad (2.35)\end{aligned}$$

Integrating (2.30) with respect to μ_0 gives,

$$\int\int \log|y-t|d\mu_0(t)d\mu_0(y) = \frac{1}{4}\int y^2 d\mu_0(y) + \frac{c_1}{2},$$

while c_1 can be determined by substituting $y = x$ in (2.30),

$$c_1 = -\frac{x^2}{2} + 2\int \log|x-t|d\mu_0(t) - c_2 x.$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}I(\mu_0) &= \frac{1}{2}\int y^2 d\mu_0(y) - \iint \log|t-y| d\mu_0(t) d\mu_0(y) - \frac{3}{4} \\ &= \frac{1}{4}\int_L^0 (x+y)^2 f_x(y)dy - \int_L^0 \log(-y) f_x(y)dy + \frac{x^2}{4} + \frac{c_2 x}{2} - \frac{3}{4}. \quad (2.36)\end{aligned}$$

Plugging L and c_2 into (2.36) gives the closed form expression for K. ■

3 Proof of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4

Recall that

$$R_1(n,m) = V_1(n,m) = \sup_{0=l_0\le l_1\le\cdots\le l_m=n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} (S_{l_j}^{m,j} - S_{l_{j-1}}^{m,j}).$$

Then, let

$$V_1^{'}(n,m) = \sup_{\substack{0=l_0\le l_1\le\cdots\le l_m=n \\ l_{j-1}=l_j \text{ for } j\notin J(m)}} \sum_{j=1}^{m} (S_{l_j}^{m,j} - S_{l_{j-1}}^{m,j}),$$

where from Lemma 9 of [9],

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left|V_1(n,m) - V_1^{'}(n,m)\right|\right) \le Cnp_{2nd}^m, \quad (3.1)$$

with $C > 0$ some absolute constant.

To prove Theorem 1.3, let us first prove a lemma,

Lemma 3.1 *Let $k(m(n))$ converge to infinity with n in such a way that $k(m(n))^3/p_{max}^m = o(n)$, then for any $x \ge 2$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{k(m(n))} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{V_1^{'}(n,m(n)) - np_{max}^m}{\sqrt{nk(m(n))p_{max}^m}} \ge x\right) = -2\int_2^x \sqrt{(z/2)^2-1}\,dz, \quad (3.2)$$

and for any $x < 2$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{k(m(n))} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{V_1^{'}(n,m(n)) - np_{max}^m}{\sqrt{nk(m(n))p_{max}^m}} \le x\right) = -\infty. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof.

As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, for any $j \in J(m)$, set $\tilde{X}_{i,j}^m = (X_{i,j}^m - p_{max}^m)/\sigma_m$, where $\sigma_m^2 = p_{max}^m(1-p_{max}^m)$, and set $\tilde{S}_k^{m,j} = \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{X}_{i,j}^m$. Hence

$$\frac{V_1^{'}(n,m) - np_{max}^m}{\sqrt{nkp_{max}^m}} = (\sqrt{1-p_{max}^m})\frac{\tilde{V}_1^{'}(n,m)}{\sqrt{nk}},$$

with the obvious notation for $\tilde{V}_1^{'}(n,m)$. Since $k(m(n))p_{max}^m \leq 1$, as $n \to \infty$, $p_{max}^m \to 0$, so (3.2) can be reduced to,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{k(m(n))} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{V}_1^{'}(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{nk(m(n))}} \geq x\right) = -I_1(x), \tag{3.4}$$

for any $x \geq 2$.

Moreover, (3.3) can be reduced to,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{k(m(n))} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{V}_1^{'}(n,m(n))}{\sqrt{nk(m(n))}} \leq x\right) = -\infty, \tag{3.5}$$

for any $x < 2$.

Since

$$\tilde{V}_1^{'}(n,m) = \sup_{\substack{0=l_0\leq l_1\leq\cdots\leq l_m=n \\ l_{j-1}=l_j \text{ for } j\notin J(m)}} \sum_{j=1}^{m} (\tilde{S}_{l_j}^{m,j} - \tilde{S}_{l_{j-1}}^{m,j}), \tag{3.6}$$

with

$$Cov(\tilde{S}_k^{m,i}, \tilde{S}_k^{m,j}) = \begin{cases} k, & \text{if } i = j, \\ k\rho_1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

where $\rho_1 = -p_{max}^m/(1-p_{max}^m)$, it can be approximated via KMT by the Brownian functional $F(n,k)$

$$F(n,k) = \sup_{0=t_0\leq t_1\leq\cdots\leq t_k=n} \sum_{r=1}^{k} (\tilde{B}_{t_r}^{(r)} - \tilde{B}_{t_{r-1}}^{(r)}), \tag{3.8}$$

where $(\tilde{B}^{(r)})_{1\leq r\leq k}$ is a k-dimensional Brownian motion with covariance matrix

$$t\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho_1 & \cdots & \rho_1 \\ \rho_1 & 1 & \cdots & \rho_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho_1 & \rho_1 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover,

$$F(n,k) \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \sqrt{n}F(1,k), \tag{3.9}$$

while from Corollary 3.2 and Corollary 3.3 in [14],

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{1-p_{max}^m}F(1,k) \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} && (3.10) \\ &\frac{\sqrt{1-kp_{max}^m}-1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k} B_1^j + \sup_{0=t_0\leq t_1\leq\cdots\leq t_k=1} \sum_{r=1}^{k} (B_{t_r}^r - B_{t_{r-1}}^r), \end{aligned}$$

where $(B^j)_{1\le j\le k}$ is a standard k-dimensional Brownian motion. Looking at the right hand side of (3.10), the first sum is a Gaussian random variable with variance at most $1/k$, while for the second part, it is well known that:

$$\sup_{0=t_0\le t_1\le\cdots\le t_k=1}\sum_{r=1}^{k}(B^r_{t_r}-B^r_{t_{r-1}})\overset{\mathcal{L}}{=}\lambda_1^k, \tag{3.11}$$

where λ_1^k is the largest eigenvalue of a $k\times k$ element of the GUE (see the Introduction). For the large deviation of $F(1,k)$ when it is on the left of its asymptotic mean, since $\lambda_1^k/\sqrt{k}$ satisfies a LDP with rate function I_1 and since the contribution of the Gaussian term is negligible, we get, as shown in the Appendix, that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{1}{k}\log\mathbb{P}(F(1,k)\ge\sqrt{k}x)=-I_1(x). \tag{3.12}$$

Next, as in the proof of Theorem 1.1,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}&\left(\left|\tilde V_1^{'}(n,m)-F(n,k)\right|\ge\sqrt{nk}\epsilon\right)\\&\qquad\le k\left(\mathbb{P}\left(Y_n^{m,l}\ge\frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{4\sqrt{k}}\right)+\mathbb{P}\left(W_n^l\ge\frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{4\sqrt{k}}\right)\right),\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where l is any element of $J(m)$ and

$$Y_n^{m,l}=\max_{1\le i\le n}|\tilde S_i^{m,l}-\tilde B_i^{(l)}| \quad\text{and}\quad W_n^l=\sup_{\substack{0\le s,t\le n\\|s-t|\le 1}}|\tilde B_s^{(l)}-\tilde B_t^{(l)}|.$$

As in getting (2.8), we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Y_n^{m,1}\ge\frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{4\sqrt{k}}\right)\le(1+c_2(p^m_{max})\sqrt{n})\exp\left\{-c_1(p^m_{max})\frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{4\sqrt{k}}\right\}, \tag{3.14}$$

where $c_1(p^m_{max})\sim C_1\sqrt{p^m_{max}}$ and $c_2(m)\sim C_2\sqrt{p^m_{max}}$, for some constants C_1 and C_2, and from (2.9),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(W_n^1\ge\frac{\sqrt{n}\epsilon}{4\sqrt{k}}\right)\le C_3 n\exp\left\{-\frac{n\epsilon^2}{C_3 k}\right\}, \tag{3.15}$$

for some positive constant C_3. Combining (3.14) and (3.15), under the condition $k(m(n))^3/p^m_{max}=o(n)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde V_1^{'}(n,m)-F(n,k)\right|\ge\sqrt{nk}\epsilon\right)\le C_4 k\sqrt{np^m_{max}}\exp\left\{-\frac{\sqrt{np^m_{max}}\epsilon}{C_4\sqrt{k}}\right\}, \tag{3.16}$$

for some positive constant C_4. From (3.12), for any $x>2$ and $0<\epsilon<(x-2)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(F(n,k)\ge\sqrt{nk}(x\pm\epsilon))=\exp\{-k(I_1(x\pm\epsilon)+o(1))\}. \tag{3.17}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde{V}_1^{'}(n,m)-F(n,k)\right|\geq\sqrt{nk}\epsilon\right)}{\mathbb{P}(F(n,k)\geq\sqrt{nk}(x\pm\epsilon))}\\
&\leq C_4k\sqrt{np_{max}^m}\exp\left\{\sqrt{\frac{np_{max}^m}{k}}\left[-\frac{\epsilon}{C_4}+\sqrt{\frac{k^3}{np_{max}^m}}\left(I_1(x\pm\epsilon)+o(1)\right)\right]\right\}\\
&\to 0,\quad \text{as } n\to\infty,\quad k(m(n))^3/p_{max}^m=o(n),
\end{aligned}$$

and as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, this leads to (3.4) for any $x>2$. Applying the same arguments at the end of the proof of Theorem 1.1 we can prove that (3.4) is valid for any $x\geq 2$.

The proof of (3.5) is similar to the uniform case. First, from (3.10) and (3.11), for any fixed $x<2$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{1}{k}\log\mathbb{P}(F(1,k)\leq\sqrt{k}x)=-\infty. \tag{3.18}$$

Moreover, for any $0<\epsilon<2-x$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{V}_1^{'}(n,m)\leq\sqrt{nk}x\right)\leq\\
&\qquad\mathbb{P}\left(F(n,k)\leq\sqrt{nk}(x+\epsilon)\right)+\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde{V}_1^{'}(n,m)-F(n,k)\right|\geq\sqrt{nk}\epsilon\right),
\end{aligned}\tag{3.19}$$

while $\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde{V}_1^{'}(n,m)-F(n,k)\right|\geq\sqrt{nk}\epsilon\right)$ can be further controlled by $e^{-k(m)T}$, with $T>0$, arbitrarily large. Hence (3.5) holds true under the condition $k(m(n))^3/p_{max}^m=o(n)$. ■

Proof of Theorem 1.3

Set $X=(V_1(n,m)-np_{max}^m)/\sqrt{nkp_{max}^m}$, $Y=(V_1(n,m)-V_1^{'}(n,m))/\sqrt{nkp_{max}^m}$ and $Z=(V_1^{'}(n,m)-np_{max}^m)/\sqrt{nkp_{max}^m}$. For any $x>2$ and $0<\epsilon<x-2$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X\geq x)\leq\mathbb{P}(Z\geq x-\epsilon)+\mathbb{P}(|Y|\geq\epsilon), \tag{3.20}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(X\geq x)\geq\mathbb{P}(Z\geq x+\epsilon)-\mathbb{P}(|Y|\geq\epsilon). \tag{3.21}$$

Moreover, from (3.1)

$$\mathbb{P}(|Y|\geq\epsilon)\leq\frac{Cp_{2nd}^m\sqrt{n}}{\epsilon\sqrt{kp_{max}^m}}, \tag{3.22}$$

and from Lemma 3.1,

$$\mathbb{P}(Z\geq x\pm\epsilon)=\exp\{-k[I_1(x\pm\epsilon)+o(1)]\}.$$

Under the condition (1.12), we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(|Y| \geq \epsilon)}{\mathbb{P}(Z \geq x \pm \epsilon)} \leq \frac{Cp_{2nd}^m \sqrt{n}}{\epsilon \sqrt{kp_{max}^m}} \exp\{k[I_1(x \pm \epsilon) + o(1)]\} \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty. \tag{3.23}$$

Letting ϵ go to 0, and repeating the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, proves (1.13), for any $x \geq 2$, under the conditions given in Theorem 1.3. For (1.14), for any $x < 2$ and $0 < \epsilon < 2 - x$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq x) \leq \mathbb{P}(Z \leq x + \epsilon) + \mathbb{P}(|Y| \geq \epsilon).$$

From (3.3), $\mathbb{P}(Z \leq x + \epsilon)$ is exponentially negligible with speed $k(m)$, and from arguments as in (3.23), $\mathbb{P}(|Y| \geq \epsilon)$ is bounded by $e^{-k(m)T}$, $T > 0$, as $n \to \infty$. Hence, letting $T \to \infty$, $\mathbb{P}(|Y| \geq \epsilon)$ is also exponentially negligible with speed $k(m)$, which proves (1.14). ■

Proof of Theorem 1.4 and Remark 1.3

First, (1.19) is a direct consequence of (1.13). Next, we prove (1.18). As in the proof of Lemma 3.1, when $V_1^{'}(n,m)$, is on the left of its simultaneous asymptotic mean, it can be approximated by $F(n,k)$ (see (3.8)). Hence the rate function K_η should be the corresponding rate function of the Brownian functional $F(1,k)$ (see (3.9)) when it is on the left of its asymptotic mean, with convergence rate $k(m)^2$. From the right hand side of (3.10) we know that this new rate function K_η will depend on η, which is the limit of kp_{max}^m. Moreover, for $F(1,k)$, and from [16],

$$\sqrt{1 - p_{max}^m} F(1,k) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \tilde{\lambda}_1^0,$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_1^0$ is the largest eigenvalue of the diagonal block corresponding to p_{max}^m in $\mathbf{X^0}$, and where $\mathbf{X^0}$ is an element of $\mathcal{G}^0(p_1^m, p_2^m, \cdots, p_m^m)$. So the rate function K_η should also be the corresponding rate function of $\tilde{\lambda}_1^0$ when it is on the left of its asymptotic mean with convergence rate $k(m)^2$.

Again, from [16],

$$\lambda_1^k \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \tilde{\lambda}_1^0 + \sqrt{p_{max}^m} g. \tag{3.24}$$

where λ_1^k is the largest eigenvalue of the $k \times k$ GUE and g is a standard normal random variable which is independent of $\tilde{\lambda}_1^0$.

Let

$$J(x) = \begin{cases} \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}((-\infty, x])} I(\mu), & \text{if } x \in (-\infty, 2], \\ 0, & \text{if } x \in [2, +\infty), \end{cases} \tag{3.25}$$

$$G_\eta(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x^2}{2\eta}, & \text{if } x \in (-\infty, 0], \\ 0, & \text{if } x \in [0, +\infty), \end{cases} \tag{3.26}$$

where J is the rate function for λ_1^k with speed k^2, $I(\mu)$ is given in (A.5), and G_η is the corresponding rate function for the Gaussian term. Now, see [10], when $x \leq 2$,

$$J(x) = \frac{1}{216}\Bigg(-x\left(-72x + x^3 + 30\sqrt{12+x^2} + x^2\sqrt{12+x^2}\right) \\ - 216\log\left(\frac{1}{6}\left(x + \sqrt{12+x^2}\right)\right)\Bigg). \tag{3.27}$$

Hence,

$$J'(x) = \frac{1}{54}\left(-x^3 + 36x - (12+x^2)^{3/2}\right), \tag{3.28}$$

$$J''(x) = \frac{1}{18}\left(12 - x^2 - x\sqrt{12+x^2}\right). \tag{3.29}$$

Notice that $0 < J''(x) < 1$ for $x \in (-\infty, 2)$. Moreover, by Taylor expansions for J and J', and for $x < -5$,

$$J(x) = \frac{x^2}{2} + \log(-x) + \frac{3}{4} + e_1(x), \tag{3.30}$$

$$J'(x) = x + \frac{1}{x} + e_2(x), \tag{3.31}$$

with $|e_1(x)| \leq 2/x^2$ and $|e_2(x)| \leq 4/|x|^3$.

From (3.24), it is well known (see [11], [26]) that,

$$J(x) = K_\eta \Box G_\eta(x) := \inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}}\{K_\eta(y) + G_\eta(x-y)\}, \tag{3.32}$$

and taking Legendre transforms to get

$$K_\eta(x) = \left(J^*(y) - G_\eta^*(y)\right)^*(x),$$

where

$$G^*(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{\eta y^2}{2}, & \text{if } y \leq 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } y > 0, \end{cases}$$

so

$$K_\eta(x) = \sup_{y\leq 0}\left(xy - J^*(y) + \frac{\eta y^2}{2}\right). \tag{3.33}$$

Hence for $\eta = 0$, $K_0 = J$, for $\eta = 1$, $K_1 = K$, while for $0 < \eta < 1$, K_η interpolates between J and K. From the very definition of the Legendre transform,

$$J^*(y) = \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\left(xy - J(x)\right),$$

for each $y \leq 0$, there exists a unique solution to $J'(x) = y$ on $x \in (-\infty, 2]$, and we denote this solution by $S(y)$. S is an increasing function on $(-\infty, 0]$ with $S(0) = 2$, $\lim_{y\to-\infty} S(y) = -\infty$ and

$$S'(y) = \frac{1}{J''(S(y))},$$

for $y < 0$. Thus for $y \leq 2$,

$$J^*(y) = yS(y) - J(S(y)).$$

And as a consequence,

$$K_\eta(x) = \sup_{y \leq 0} \left(xy - yS(y) + J(S(y)) + \frac{\eta y^2}{2} \right).$$

For $y \leq 0$, let

$$H_{x,\eta}(y) := xy - yS(y) + J(S(y)) + \frac{\eta y^2}{2},$$

then

$$H'_{x,\eta}(y) = x - S(y) + \eta y, \; H''_{x,\eta}(y) = -\frac{1}{J''(S(y))} + \eta,$$

so $H''_{x,\eta}(y) < 0$ for $y \in (-\infty, 0)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$. When $x \geq 2$, for any $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $H'_{x,\eta}(y) > 0$ for $y < 0$ with $H'_{x,\eta}(0) \geq 0$, thus $K_\eta(x) = \sup_{y \leq 0} H_{x,\eta}(y) = H_{x,\eta}(0) = 0$.

Now we consider the case when $x < 2$. First, from (3.31), it can be shown that for $y < -6$,

$$y < S(y) < y + 1,$$

and thus since $x - J'(x)$ is increasing on $(-\infty, 2]$,

$$S(y) - y = S(y) - J'(S(y)) < y + 1 - J'(y+1) < -\frac{2}{y+1},$$

which further yields

$$y < S(y) < y - \frac{2}{y+1}.$$

Moreover, when $y < -6$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| H_{x,\eta}(y) - \left(xy - y^2 + J(y) + \frac{\eta y^2}{2} \right) \right| &\leq |y| \, |S(y) - y| + |J(S(y)) - J(y)| \\
&\leq 2 \left| \frac{y}{y+1} \right| + |J'(y)| \, |S(y) - y| \\
&\leq 3 + 3 = 6. \qquad (3.34)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.34) with (3.30), we get that for $y < -6$,

$$\left| H_{x,\eta}(y) - \left(xy + \log(-y) - \frac{1-\eta}{2} y^2 \right) \right| \leq 7. \qquad (3.35)$$

When $\eta = 1$, for any $x \leq 0$, $H'_{x,1}(y) < 0$ for $y \leq 0$, thus

$$K_1(x) = \lim_{y \to -\infty} H_{x,1}(y) = +\infty.$$

For $0 < x < 2$, since $S(y) - y$ is increasing on $(-\infty, 0]$ with a range of $(0, 2]$, there exists a unique solution to $H'_{x,1}(y) = x - S(y) + y = 0$, and we denote it by $T_1(x)$. Note that $y = T_1(x)$ is the maximizer for $H_{x,1}(y)$ and as $x \to 0$, $T_1(x) \to -\infty$, thus there exists some $\delta > 0$, such that when $x < \delta$,

$$K_1(x) = \sup_{y \le -6} H_{x,1}(y).$$

Since for $x < 1/6$,

$$\sup_{y \le -6} (xy + \log(-y)) = -1 - \log x,$$

combining this with (3.35) gives for x close enough to 0,

$$|K_1(x) - (-\log x)| \le 8.$$

When $0 < \eta < 1$, for any $x < 2$, there exists a unique solution to $H'_{x,\eta}(y) = x - S(y) + \eta y = 0$, which is denoted by $T_\eta(x)$. Note that $y = T_\eta(x)$ is the maximizer of $H_{x,\eta}(y)$ and as $x \to -\infty$, $T_\eta(x) \to -\infty$. By repeating arguments as in the case $\eta = 1$ we get as $x \to -\infty$,

$$K_\eta(x) \sim \frac{x^2}{2(1-\eta)} + \log\left(-\frac{x}{1-\eta}\right),$$

which is consistent with $J(x)$ when $\eta = 0$.

The rest of the proof follows exactly the proof of Lemma 3.1 and of Theorem 1.3. ■

4 Proof of Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.6

Left and right concentration inequalities for the largest eigenvalue λ_1^m of an element of the $m \times m$ GUE are respectively given in [1] and [20]. More precisely:

Proposition 4.1 *Let $m \ge 1$ and let $\epsilon > 0$, then for some absolute positive constant C_0,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_1^m \ge 2\sqrt{m}(1+\epsilon)) \le C_0 e^{-m\epsilon^{3/2}/C_0}. \tag{4.1}$$

Likewise, for some absolute positive constant $\bar{C}_0$, and all $m \ge 1$ and $0 < \epsilon \le 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_1^m \le 2\sqrt{m}(1-\epsilon)) \le \bar{C}_0 e^{-m^2\epsilon^3/\bar{C}_0}. \tag{4.2}$$

Next, to prove (1.21), assume first that $m\epsilon^{3/2} \ge 1$. Then for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{V_1(n,m) - n/m}{\sqrt{n/m}} \ge 2\sqrt{m}(1+\epsilon)\right) \\ &\le \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m-1}{m}}\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m)}{2\sqrt{mn}} \ge 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \\ &\qquad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m-1}{m}}\frac{|\tilde{V}_1(n,m) - \tilde{L}_1(n,m)|}{2\sqrt{mn}} \ge \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

As previously,

$$\sqrt{\frac{m-1}{m}}\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m)}{\sqrt{n}} \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \lambda_1^{m,0},$$

and

$$\lambda_1^m \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \lambda_1^{m,0} + Z_m,$$

where Z_m is a centered Gaussian random variable with variance $1/m$, which is independent of $\lambda_1^{m,0}$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m-1}{m}}\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m)}{2\sqrt{mn}} \geq 1+\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_1^m \geq 2\sqrt{m}\left(1+\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right)\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(Z_m \geq \frac{\sqrt{m}\epsilon}{2}\right)\\ &\leq C_1 e^{-m\epsilon^{3/2}/C_1} + C_1 e^{-m^2\epsilon^2/C_1},\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant C_1. Now from (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9), the second term on the right hand side of (4.3) is bounded by:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|\tilde{V}_1(n,m)-\tilde{L}_1(n,m)|}{2\sqrt{mn}} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \leq C_2\sqrt{mn}e^{-\sqrt{n}\epsilon/C_2 m} + C_2 mn e^{-n\epsilon^2/C_2 m}.$$

In order to reach (1.21), we need to show that there exists a positive constant $C(A,\alpha)$, depending only on A and α, such that

$$C(A,\alpha)e^{-m\epsilon^{3/2}/C(A,\alpha)} \geq C_1 e^{-m^2\epsilon^2/C_1}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$C(A,\alpha)e^{-m\epsilon^{3/2}/C(A,\alpha)} \geq C_2\sqrt{mn}e^{-\sqrt{n}\epsilon/C_2 m}, \tag{4.5}$$

$$C(A,\alpha)e^{-m\epsilon^{3/2}/C(A,\alpha)} \geq C_2 mn e^{-n\epsilon^2/C_2 m}. \tag{4.6}$$

First, since $m\epsilon^{3/2} \geq 1$, (4.4) can be satisfied by choosing $C(A,\alpha) \geq C_1$. Now taking logarithms in (4.5), $C(A,\alpha)$ has to be such that:

$$\log\frac{C_2}{C(A,\alpha)} + \frac{1}{2}\log(mn) \leq m\epsilon^{3/2}\left(-\frac{1}{C(A,\alpha)} + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{C_2 m^2\epsilon^{1/2}}\right). \tag{4.7}$$

Moreover, under the condition $m \leq An^\alpha$, we have:

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}}{C_2 m^2\epsilon^{1/2}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{C_2 m^2} \geq \frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}-2\alpha}}{A^2 C_2}.$$

Therefore, if $\alpha < 1/4$, we just need to choose $C(A,\alpha)$ satisfying

$$\log\frac{\sqrt{A}C_2}{C(A,\alpha)} + \frac{1}{C(A,\alpha)} \leq \frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}-2\alpha}}{A^2 C_2} - \frac{1+\alpha}{2}\log n.$$

Since for all integers $n \geq 1$,

$$\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}-2\alpha}}{A^2 C_2} - \frac{1+\alpha}{2}\log n \geq \frac{1+\alpha}{1-4\alpha}\left(1-\log\frac{A^2 C_2(1+\alpha)}{1-4\alpha}\right),$$

we just need to guarantee that

$$\log \frac{\sqrt{A}C_2}{C(A,\alpha)} + \frac{1}{C(A,\alpha)} \leq \frac{1+\alpha}{1-4\alpha}\left(1 - \log \frac{A^2 C_2(1+\alpha)}{1-4\alpha}\right). \tag{4.8}$$

But from our choice of α, $(1+\alpha)/(1-4\alpha) > 1$, so by choosing

$$C(A,\alpha) \geq C \max\{A^{5/2}, 1\} \frac{1+\alpha}{1-4\alpha} \exp\left\{\frac{1+\alpha}{1-4\alpha}\right\}, \tag{4.9}$$

for some large enough absolute constant C, (4.8) and (4.5) are satisfied. Finally, by taking logarithms, (4.6) becomes,

$$\log \frac{C_2}{C(A,\alpha)} + \log(mn) \leq m\epsilon^{3/2}\left(-\frac{1}{C(A,\alpha)} + \frac{n\epsilon^{1/2}}{C_2 m^2}\right). \tag{4.10}$$

From the condition $m \leq An^\alpha$, we just need,

$$\log \frac{AC_2}{C(A,\alpha)} + \frac{1}{C(A,\alpha)} \leq \frac{1}{A^{7/3}C_2} n^{1-\frac{7\alpha}{3}} - (1+\alpha)\log n. \tag{4.11}$$

Now repeating the previous arguments, taking the minimum on the right hand side of (4.11), we have

$$\log \frac{AC_2}{C(A,\alpha)} + \frac{1}{C(A,\alpha)} \leq \frac{1+\alpha}{1-7\alpha/3}\left(1 - \log \frac{A^{7/3} C_2(1+\alpha)}{1-7\alpha/3}\right). \tag{4.12}$$

Again, for $0 < \alpha < 1/4$, $1 < (1+\alpha)/(1-7\alpha/3) < 3$, so as long as we choose

$$C(A,\alpha) \geq C \max\{A^{10/3}, 1\} \frac{1+\alpha}{1-7\alpha/3} \exp\left\{\frac{1+\alpha}{1-7\alpha/3}\right\}, \tag{4.13}$$

for some large enough absolute constant C, $C(A,\alpha)$ will satisfy (4.12) and hence also satisfy (4.6).

Combining (4.9) and (4.13), if $m\epsilon^{3/2} \geq 1$, and $m \leq An^\alpha$, with $\alpha < 1/4$, we can find a positive constant

$$C(A,\alpha) = C \max\{A^{10/3}, 1\} \frac{1+\alpha}{1-4\alpha} \exp\left\{\frac{1+\alpha}{1-4\alpha}\right\}, \tag{4.14}$$

so that (1.21) holds for all $0 < \epsilon < 1$. When $m\epsilon^{3/2} < 1$,

$$C(A,\alpha) e^{-m\epsilon^{3/2}/C(A,\alpha)} \geq Ce^{-1/C} \geq 1,$$

as C is large enough, and (1.21) follows naturally. So combining these two cases, we can find a positive $C(A,\alpha)$ as in (4.14), with C large enough, such that (1.21) holds.

Likewise, for the proof of (1.22), first assume that $m^2\epsilon^3 \geq 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{V_1(n,m)-n/m}{\sqrt{n/m}} \geq 2\sqrt{m}(1-\epsilon)\right) && (4.15)\\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m-1}{m}}\frac{\tilde{L}_1(n,m)}{2\sqrt{mn}} \leq 1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)\\
&\qquad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m-1}{m}}\frac{|\tilde{V}_1(n,m)-\tilde{L}_1(n,m)|}{2\sqrt{mn}} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)\\
&\leq C_1e^{-m^2\epsilon^3/C_1} + C_1e^{-m^2\epsilon^2/C_1} + C_2\sqrt{mn}e^{-\sqrt{n}\epsilon/C_2m} + C_2mne^{-n\epsilon^2/C_2m}.
\end{aligned}$$

Repeating previous arguments, we get that, as long as $m \leq An^\alpha$, with $\alpha < 1/6$, we can find some positive constant

$$\bar{C}(A,\alpha) = \bar{C}\max\{A^4,1\}\frac{1+\alpha}{1-6\alpha}\exp\left\{\frac{1+\alpha}{1-6\alpha}\right\},$$

so that (1.22) is satisfied. Again, by taking $\bar{C}$ large enough, the case $m^2\epsilon^3 < 1$ follows, and (1.22) is proved. ■

The proof for the non-uniform case is similar to the uniform one. For (1.24), we first assume that $k\epsilon^{3/2} \geq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{V_1(n,m)-np_{max}^m}{\sqrt{nkp_{max}^m}} \geq 2(1+\epsilon)\right)\\
&\quad\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{V_1(n,m)-V_1^{'}(n,m)}{2\sqrt{nkp_{max}^m}} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{1-p_{max}^m}\frac{\tilde{V}_1^{'}(n,m)-F(n,k)}{2\sqrt{nk}} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right)\\
&\quad+\mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{1-p_{max}^m}\frac{F(n,k)}{2\sqrt{nk}} \geq 1+\frac{\epsilon}{3}\right)\\
&\quad\quad= A_1+A_2+A_3.
\end{aligned}$$

From (3.22), (3.13) and (3.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &\leq \frac{C_1p_{2nd}^m\sqrt{n}}{\epsilon\sqrt{kp_{max}^m}},\\
A_2 &\leq C_2nk\exp\left\{-\frac{n\epsilon^2}{C_2k}\right\} + C_2k\sqrt{np_{max}^m}\exp\left\{-\frac{\sqrt{np_{max}^m}\epsilon}{C_2\sqrt{k}}\right\},\\
A_3 &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(Z_k \geq \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_1^k \geq 2\left(1+\frac{\epsilon}{6}\right)\right)\\
&\quad\leq C_3\exp\left\{-\frac{k^2\epsilon^2}{C_3}\right\} + C_3\exp\left\{-\frac{k\epsilon^{3/2}}{C_3}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to reach (1.24), we need to show that there exists a positive $C(A,B,\alpha)$, depending only on A, B and α, such that

$$C(A,B,\alpha)\exp\left\{-\frac{k\epsilon^{3/2}}{C(A,B,\alpha)}\right\} \geq \frac{C_1 p_{2nd}^m\sqrt{n}}{\epsilon\sqrt{kp_{max}^m}}, \tag{4.16}$$

$$C(A,B,\alpha)\exp\left\{-\frac{k\epsilon^{3/2}}{C(A,B,\alpha)}\right\} \geq C_2 nk\exp\left\{-\frac{n\epsilon^2}{C_2 k}\right\}, \tag{4.17}$$

$$C(A,B,\alpha)\exp\left\{-\frac{k\epsilon^{3/2}}{C(A,B,\alpha)}\right\} \geq C_2 k\sqrt{np_{max}^m}\exp\left\{-\frac{\sqrt{np_{max}^m}\epsilon}{C_2\sqrt{k}}\right\}, \tag{4.18}$$

$$C(A,B,\alpha)\exp\left\{-\frac{k\epsilon^{3/2}}{C(A,B,\alpha)}\right\} \geq C_3\exp\left\{-\frac{k^2\epsilon^2}{C_3}\right\}. \tag{4.19}$$

First, by taking logarithms in (4.18), we get

$$\log\frac{C_2}{C(A,B,\alpha)} + \log k + \frac{1}{2}\log(np_{max}^m) \leq k\epsilon^{3/2}\left(-\frac{1}{C(A,B,\alpha)} + \frac{\sqrt{np_{max}^m}}{C_2\sqrt{\epsilon k^3}}\right).$$

Next,

$$\frac{\sqrt{np_{max}^m}}{C_2\sqrt{\epsilon k^3}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{(np_{max}^m)^{1-3/\alpha}}}{A^{3/2\alpha}C_2},$$

so if $\alpha > 3$, then we can choose a constant $C(A,B,\alpha)$, satisfying (4.18). Actually here $C(A,B,\alpha)$ just needs to satisfy

$$\log\frac{A^{1/\alpha}C_2}{C(A,B,\alpha)} + \frac{1}{C(A,B,\alpha)} \leq \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha-3}\left(1-\log\frac{A^{3/2\alpha}C_2(\alpha+2)}{\alpha-3}\right),$$

which forces

$$C(A,B,\alpha) \geq C\max\{A^{2/\alpha},1\}\frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha-3}\exp\left\{\frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha-3}\right\}, \tag{4.20}$$

for a large enough absolute constant C.

Second, by taking logarithms in (4.16), we have:

$$\log\frac{C_1}{C(A,B,\alpha)} + \log\left(\frac{p_{2nd}^m\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{kp_{max}^m}}\right) \leq -\frac{k\epsilon^{3/2}}{C(A,B,\alpha)} + \log\epsilon.$$

From (1.23) and the assumption $k\epsilon^{3/2} \geq 1$, in order for (4.16) to hold true, $C(A,B,\alpha)$ needs to satisfy

$$\log\frac{C_1\sqrt{B}}{C(A,B,\alpha)} - \frac{k}{2} \leq -\frac{k}{C(A,B,\alpha)} - \frac{2}{3}\log k,$$

which further forces

$$C(A,B,\alpha) \geq C\max\{\sqrt{B},1\}, \tag{4.21}$$

with the absolute constant C large enough.

For (4.17), as we did in (4.6), and under the condition $k^\alpha/p_{max}^m \le An$ with $\alpha > 3$, we need to choose

$$C(A, B, \alpha) \ge C \max\{A^{10/3\alpha}, 1\} \frac{3\alpha+3}{3\alpha-7} \exp\left\{\frac{3\alpha+3}{3\alpha-7}\right\}, \tag{4.22}$$

with the absolute constant C large enough. Finally, (4.19) is easy to satisfy since $k\epsilon^{3/2} \ge 1$. Moreover, when $k\epsilon^{3/2} < 1$, then (1.24) holds naturally given C large enough.

Combining (4.20), (4.21) and (4.22), choosing

$$C(A, B, \alpha) = C \max\{A^{10/3\alpha}, 1\} \max\{\sqrt{B}, 1\} \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha-3} \exp\left\{\frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha-3}\right\},$$

with C some large enough absolute constant, (1.24) holds under the given conditions. Likewise, we can prove (1.26). ■

A Appendix. Large deviations for the spectrum of the traceless GUE

For any integer $m \ge 2$, let the random matrix $\mathbf{X}$ be an element of the $m \times m$ GUE. Let $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots, \lambda_m)$ be the spectrum of $\mathbf{X}$, and let

$$(\xi_1, \xi_2, \cdots, \xi_m) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots, \lambda_m).$$

The joint probability density of $(\xi_1, \xi_2, \cdots, \xi_m)$ is given by

$$\phi_m(\xi_1, \xi_2, \cdots, \xi_m) = \frac{1}{Z_m} \exp\left\{-\frac{m}{2}\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^2\right\} \prod_{1\le i<j\le m} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2, \tag{A.1}$$

where

$$Z_m = (2\pi)^{\frac{m}{2}} m^{-\frac{m^2}{2}} \prod_{j=1}^m j!, \tag{A.2}$$

see Theorem 2.5.2 in [3] and also Theorem 3.3.1 in [24].

Let $(\lambda_1^0, \lambda_2^0, \cdots, \lambda_m^0)$ be the spectrum of $\mathbf{X} - tr(\mathbf{X})/m$, an element of the $m \times m$ traceless GUE, and again, let

$$(\xi_1^0, \xi_2^0, \cdots, \xi_m^0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} (\lambda_1^0, \lambda_2^0, \cdots, \lambda_m^0).$$

The joint distribution function of $(\xi_1^0, \xi_2^0, \cdots, \xi_m^0)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\xi_1^0 \le s_1, \xi_2^0 \le s_2, \cdots, \xi_m^0 \le s_m\right) \\ &= \sqrt{2\pi} \int_{\mathcal{L}(s_1,\cdots,s_m)} \phi_m(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_m) dx_1 \cdots dx_{m-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}(s_1,\cdots,s_m) := \Big\{ x=(x_1,\cdots,x_m)\in\mathbb{R}^m : \sum_{i=1}^m x_i = 0, \textit{and } x_i < s_j, \\ \textit{for each } i=1,\cdots,m \Big\}.$$

Let $(\xi_1^m,\xi_2^m,\cdots,\xi_m^m)$ be the nonincreasing rearrangement of $(\xi_1,\xi_2,\cdots,\xi_m)$, and let $(\xi_1^{m,0},\xi_2^{m,0},\cdots,\xi_m^{m,0})$ be the nonincreasing rearrangement of $(\xi_1^0,\xi_2^0,\cdots,\xi_m^0)$, then, *e.g.*, see [16],

$$(\xi_1^m,\xi_2^m,\cdots,\xi_m^m) \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} (\xi_1^{m,0},\xi_2^{m,0},\cdots,\xi_m^{m,0}) + g_m \mathbf{e}_m, \tag{A.4}$$

where g_m is a centered Gaussian random variable with variance $1/m^2$, independent of the vector $(\xi_1^{m,0},\xi_2^{m,0},\cdots,\xi_m^{m,0})$, and where $\mathbf{e}_m=(1,1,\cdots,1)$.

As shown in [7], the law of the spectral measure $\hat{\mu}^m = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{\xi_i}$ satisfies a large deviation principle on the set $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$, and with good rate function I, in the scale m^2. Moreover, I is given by

$$I(\mu) = \frac{1}{2}\int x^2 d\mu(x) - \iint \log|x-y| d\mu(x)d\mu(y) - \frac{3}{4}, \tag{A.5}$$

and its unique minimizer is the semicircular probability measure

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{2\pi}\mathbf{1}_{|x|\le 2}\sqrt{4-x^2}dx.$$

Based on this LDP for $\hat{\mu}^m$, the LDP for the largest (or rth largest) eigenvalue of the GOE with an explicit rate function is obtained in [6] and [2] (see also [18] for generalizations). Following the approach and the techniques developed there, and taking into account (A.4), we get a multidimensional LDP for the first r eigenvalues of the traceless GUE:

Theorem A.1 *Let $r\in\mathbb{N}$, on $\mathcal{L}^r := \{(x_1,x_2,\cdots,x_r)\in\mathbb{R}^r : x_1\ge x_2\ge\cdots\ge x_r\}$, $(\xi_1^{m,0},\xi_2^{m,0},\cdots,\xi_r^{m,0})$ satisfies a LDP with speed m and a good rate function*

$$I_r(x_1,x_2,\cdots,x_r) = \begin{cases} 2\sum_{i=1}^r \int_2^{x_i}\sqrt{(z/2)^2-1}dz, & \textit{if } x_1\ge x_2\cdots\ge x_r\ge 2, \\ +\infty, & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let

$$Q_m(d\xi_1,d\xi_2,\cdots,d\xi_m) = \frac{1}{Z_m}\exp\left\{-\frac{m}{2}\sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i^2\right\}\prod_{1\le i<j\le m}(\xi_i-\xi_j)^2\prod_{i=1}^m d\xi_i.$$

From [6], $(\xi_1^m,\xi_2^m,\cdots,\xi_r^m)$ satisfies a LDP with speed m and rate function I_r on $\mathcal{L}^r$. To prove the validity of the same results for $(\xi_1^{m,0},\xi_2^{m,0},\cdots,\xi_r^{m,0})$, it is enough to show that

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\frac{1}{m}\log Q_m(\xi_r^{m,0}\le x) = -\infty, \tag{A.6}$$

for any $x < 2$, and since $I_r(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_r)$ is continuous, increasing for any individual variable, on $\mathcal{L}^r \cap [2,\infty)^r$,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m} \log Q_m \left(\xi_1^{m,0} \geq x_1, \cdots, \xi_r^{m,0} \geq x_r\right) = -2\sum_{i=1}^{r} \int_2^{x_i} \sqrt{(z/2)^2-1}dz, \tag{A.7}$$

for all $x_1 \geq x_2 \cdots \geq x_r \geq 2$.

First, for $x < 2$, let $\delta = 2 - x$, so

$$\begin{aligned} Q_m(\xi_r^{m,0} \leq x) &\leq Q_m(\xi_r^{m,0} + g_m \leq x + \delta/2) + \mathbb{P}(g_m \geq \delta/2) \\ &= Q_m(\xi_r^{m} \leq x + \delta/2) + \mathbb{P}(g_m \geq \delta/2). \end{aligned}$$

Since,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(g_m \geq \delta\right) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} m\delta} e^{-m^2\delta^2/2}, \quad \text{as } m \to \infty, \tag{A.8}$$

(A.6) follows.

For (A.7), fix $x_1 \geq x_2 \cdots \geq x_r \geq 2$, for any $0 < \epsilon < x_r$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m} \log Q_m \left(\xi_1^{m,0} \geq x_1, \cdots, \xi_r^{m,0} \geq x_r\right) \\ &\leq \limsup_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m} \log\left(Q_m\left(\xi_1^{m} \geq x_1 - \epsilon, \cdots, \xi_r^{m} \geq x_r - \epsilon\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(g_m \geq \epsilon\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$Q_m\left(\xi_1^{m} \geq x_1 - \epsilon, \cdots, \xi_r^{m} \geq x_r - \epsilon\right) = \exp\{-m(I_r(x_1-\epsilon, x_2-\epsilon, \cdots, x_r-\epsilon)+o(1))\},$$

where $o(1)$ goes to 0 as m goes to infinity. So for fixed $0 < \epsilon < x_r$,

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(g_m \geq \epsilon)}{Q_m\left(\xi_1^{m} \geq x_1 - \epsilon, \cdots, \xi_r^{m} \geq x_r - \epsilon\right)} \to 0, \qquad m \to \infty,$$

hence,

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m} \log Q_m \left(\xi_1^{m,0} \geq x_1, \cdots, \xi_r^{m,0} \geq x_r\right) \leq -I_r(x_1 - \epsilon, x_2 - \epsilon, \cdots, x_r - \epsilon).$$

Likewise,

$$\liminf_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m} \log Q_m \left(\xi_1^{m,0} \geq x_1, \cdots, \xi_r^{m,0} \geq x_r\right) \geq -I_r(x_1 + \epsilon, x_2 - \epsilon, \cdots, x_r + \epsilon).$$

Letting ϵ go to 0, the continuity of the rate function leads to (A.7). ■

For any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$, construct a discrete approximation of μ by setting

$$x_i^m = \inf\left\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \mu((-\infty, x]) \geq \frac{i}{m+1}\right\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \tag{A.9}$$

and $\mu^m = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{x_i^m}$ (note that the choice of the length $1/(m+1)$ of the intervals rather that $1/m$ is only made in order to insure that x_m^m is finite). Using these discrete constructions, set:

$$\mathcal{X} = \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) : \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^m \to 0, \text{ as } m \to \infty \right\}, \tag{A.10}$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}_0(\mathbb{R}) = \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) : \int x d\mu(x) = 0 \right\}. \tag{A.11}$$

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{X}$ is a proper subset of $\mathcal{P}_0(\mathbb{R})$ since the condition in $\mathcal{X}$ implies that the mean of the measure is 0. With the help of this definition, following the proof in [7], we can get the large deviation principle for the spectral measure of the traceless GUE:

Theorem A.2 *The spectral measure $\hat{\mu}_0^m = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{\xi_i^0}$ satisfies a large deviation principle on $\mathcal{X}$ in the scale m^2 and with the good rate function I.*

Proof. Since this proof closely follows [7], it is just sketched here. Write the density of the eigenvalues as:

$$\begin{aligned} &Q_m(d\xi_1^0, d\xi_2^0, \cdots, d\xi_m^0) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{Z_m} \exp\left\{ -m^2 \iint_{x \neq y} f(x,y) d\hat{\mu}_0^m(x) d\hat{\mu}_0^m(y) \right\} \prod_{i=1}^m e^{-\frac{\xi_i^{0\,2}}{2}} d\xi_1^0 \cdots \xi_{m-1}^0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_m^0 = -\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \xi_i^0$ and

$$f(x,y) = \frac{1}{4}(x^2 + y^2) - \log|x-y|.$$

Let $\bar{Q}_m$ be the non-normalized positive measure $\bar{Q}_m = Z_m Q_m / \sqrt{2\pi}$. Via Stirling's formula,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m^2} \log \frac{Z_m}{\sqrt{2\pi}} = \int_0^1 x \log x dx - \frac{1}{2} = -\frac{3}{4}, \tag{A.12}$$

so if under $\bar{Q}_m$, $\hat{\mu}_0^m$ satisfies a large deviation with rate function

$$J(\mu) = \iint f(x,y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y), \tag{A.13}$$

then combined with (A.12), this will lead to the statement of the theorem.

First, observe that for any Borel subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$, any $N \in \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m^2} \log\left(\bar{Q}_m(\hat{\mu}_0^m \in A) \right) \leq -\inf_{\mu\in A} \left\{ \iint f(x,y) \wedge N d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \right\}. \tag{A.14}$$

Moreover, from arguments as in [7], we get that $(\hat{\mu}_0^m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ are exponentially tight under $\bar{Q}_m$ on $\mathcal{X}$. So we just need to prove $(\hat{\mu}_0^m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies a weak large deviation principle with rate function $J(\mu)$ under the measure $\bar{Q}_m$. The upper bound is obvious, since $\mu \to \iint f(x,y) \wedge N d\mu(x)d\mu(y)$ is continuous for any $\mu \in \mathcal{X}$, so (A.14) shows that for any probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 0} \limsup_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m^2} \log\left(\bar{Q}_m(\hat{\mu}_0^m \in B(\mu,\delta))\right) \le -\iint f(x,y) \wedge N d\mu(x)d\mu(y),$$

where $B(\mu,\delta)$ is an open ball of center μ and radius δ in $\mathcal{X}$, with the distance between two probability measures μ_1 and μ_2 in $\mathcal{X}$ is given by,

$$d(\mu_1,\mu_2) = \sup_{g\in Lip_b(1)} \left|\int g d\mu_1 - \int g d\mu_2\right|,$$

and where for some fixed $b \ge 0$,

$$Lip_b(1) = \{g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} : \|g\|_{Lip} \le 1,\ \|g\|_\infty \le b\}.$$

By monotone convergence,

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 0} \limsup_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m^2} \log\left(\bar{Q}_m(\hat{\mu}_0^m \in B(\mu,\delta))\right) \le -\iint f(x,y) d\mu(x)d\mu(y). \tag{A.15}$$

which finishes the proof of the upper bound.

To prove the lower bound, let $\nu \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $I(\nu) = +\infty$ if ν has an atom, we can assume without loss of generality here that it does not. Use the discrete construction (A.9) for ν with $\nu^m = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{x_i^m}$. Since ν^m converges towards ν weakly with probability 1 as m goes to infinity, for any $\delta > 0$ and m large enough, if we set $\Delta_m := \{\xi_1^0 \le \xi_2^0 \le \cdots \le \xi_m^0\}$, then

$$\bar{Q}_m(\hat{\mu}_0^m \in B(\nu,\delta)) \ge \bar{Q}_m\left(\left\{\max_{1\le i\le m-1} |\xi_i^0 - x_i^m| < \frac{\delta}{2\sqrt{m}}\right\} \cap \Delta_m\right) \tag{A.16}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ge \int_{\mathcal{T}(\xi_1,\cdots,\xi_m)} \exp\left\{-\frac{m}{2}\sum_{i=1}^m (\xi_i + x_i^m)^2\right\} \prod_{1\le i<j\le m} |\xi_i - \xi_j + x_i^m - x_j^m|^2 \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} d\xi_i \\
&\ge \prod_{i+1<j} |x_i^m - x_j^m|^2 \times \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} |x_{i+1}^m - x_i^m| \exp\left\{-\frac{m}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{m-1}(|x_i^m| + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{m}})^2\right\} \\
&\times |x_m^m - x_{m-1}^m| \exp\left\{-m(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} x_i^m)^2 - m^2\delta^2\right\} \\
&\times \int_{\mathcal{T}(\xi_1,\cdots,\xi_m)} \prod_{i=1}^{m-2} |\xi_{i+1} - \xi_i| \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} d\xi_i,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{T}(\xi_1,\cdots,\xi_m)\\&:=\left\{\max_{1\le i\le m-1}|\xi_i|<\frac{\delta}{2\sqrt{m}},\ \xi_1\le\xi_2\le\cdots\le\xi_m,\ \sum_{i=1}^m\xi_i+\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^m=0\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

The last term in the right hand side of (A.17) can be bounded from below by changing variables $\xi_1=x_1$ and $\xi_i-\xi_{i-1}=x_i,\ 2\le i\le m-1$. Set

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{R}(x_1,\cdots,x_{m-1})\\&:=\left\{-\frac{\delta}{2\sqrt{m}}\le x_1\le-\frac{\delta}{4\sqrt{m}},\text{ and }0\le x_i\le-\frac{\delta}{4m^2}\text{ for }2\le i\le m-1\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^m\to0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{T}(\xi_1,\cdots,\xi_m)}\prod_{i=1}^{m-2}|\xi_{i+1}-\xi_i|\prod_{i=1}^{m-1}d\xi_i&\ge\int_{\mathcal{R}(x_1,\cdots,x_{m-1})}\prod_{i=2}^{m-1}|x_i|\prod_{i=1}^{m-1}dx_i\\&\ge\frac{\delta}{4\sqrt{m}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\delta}{4m^2}\right)^2\right)^{m-2}.\end{aligned}\tag{A.18}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{Q}_m(\hat{\mu}_0^m\in B(\nu,\delta))&\ge\prod_{i+1<j}|x_i^m-x_j^m|^2\prod_{i=1}^{m-1}|x_{i+1}^m-x_i^m|\exp\left\{-\frac{m}{2}\sum_{i=1}^m(x_i^m)^2\right\}\\&\times|x_m^m-x_{m-1}^m|\frac{\delta}{4\sqrt{m}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\delta}{4m^2}\right)^2\right)^{m-2}\exp\left\{-\sqrt{m}\delta\sum_{i=1}^m|x_i^m|-\delta^2\right\}.\end{aligned}\tag{A.19}$$

Now by same arguments as in [7], we get

$$\liminf_{\delta\to0}\liminf_{m\to\infty}\frac{1}{m^2}\log\left(\bar{Q}_m(\hat{\mu}_0^m\in B(\nu,\delta))\right)\ge-\iint f(x,y)d\nu(x)d\nu(y).\tag{A.20}$$

Combining (A.15) and (A.20), the weak large deviation principle is proved, finishing the whole proof. ■

We are now ready to give the large deviation for $\xi_1^{m,0}$ when it is on the left of its mean. Let $\mathcal{M}((-\infty,x])$ be the set of all probability measures on $(-\infty,x], x\in\mathbb{R}$, let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty,x])=\mathcal{M}((-\infty,x])\cap\mathcal{X}$, and let $\mathcal{M}_0((-\infty,x])=\mathcal{M}((-\infty,x])\cap\mathcal{P}_0(\mathbb{R})$. Since $\{\xi_1^{m,0}\le x\}=\{\hat{\mu}_0^m\in\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty,x])\}$, then for any $x\le2$,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\frac{1}{m^2}\log\mathbb{P}\left(\xi_1^{m,0}\le x\right)=-\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty,x])}I(\mu).\tag{A.21}$$

For each $x\in\mathbb{R}$, let

$$K(x)=\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{M}_0((-\infty,x])}I(\mu).\tag{A.22}$$

When $x \geq 2$, the semicircular law σ is both in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty, x])$ and $\mathcal{M}_0((-\infty, x])$, and so $\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty,x])} I(\mu) = K(x) = I(\sigma) = 0$. Moreover, when $x \leq 0$, and since both $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty, x])$ and $\mathcal{M}_0((-\infty, x])$ are empty, it follows that $\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty,x])} I(\mu) = K(x) = I(\sigma) = +\infty$.

When $0 < x \leq 2$, and from arguments as in [17], it is next shown that K is continuous. Indeed, for any $y < 0$ and $0 < x \leq 2$, let

$$J_\mu(y, x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_y^x u^2 d\mu(u) - \int_y^x \int_y^x \log|u - t| d\mu(u) d\mu(t) - \frac{3}{4}, \tag{A.23}$$

and let ν_x be the minimizer of $I(\mu)$ on $\mathcal{M}_0((-\infty, x])$, then for any $0 < \epsilon < x$, we have

$$K(x) \leq K(x - \epsilon) \leq \frac{J_{\nu_x}(y_\epsilon, x - \epsilon)}{\nu_x^2([y_\epsilon, x - \epsilon])}, \tag{A.24}$$

where y_ϵ is the value which satisfies

$$\int_{y_\epsilon}^{x-\epsilon} t d\nu_x(t) = 0.$$

Since the right hand side of (A.24) converges to $K(x)$, as ϵ converges to 0, the left continuity of K is proved.

To show the right continuity, notice that by a simple change of variables,

$$K(x) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0((-\infty, x+\epsilon])} J_\mu^\epsilon(x),$$

where

$$J_\mu^\epsilon(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{x+\epsilon} (u - \epsilon)^2 d\mu(u) - \int_{-\infty}^{x+\epsilon} \int_{-\infty}^{x+\epsilon} \log|u - t| d\mu(u) d\mu(t) - \frac{3}{4}.$$

Therefore,

$$0 \leq K(x) - K(x + \epsilon) \leq J_{\nu_{x+\epsilon}}^\epsilon(x) - K(x + \epsilon) = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2,$$

thus by letting ϵ go to 0, the right continuity of K follows. Likewise, it can be proved that $\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty,x])} I(\mu)$ is right continuous with respect to x.

Next we need a lemma which, when combined with (A.21), gives

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m^2} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\xi_1^{m,0} \leq x\right) = -K(x), \tag{A.25}$$

for any $x \leq 2$.

Our next lemma and its proof benefited from Ionel Popescu input.

Lemma A.1 *For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty,x])} I(\mu) = K(x). \tag{A.26}$$

Proof. For $x \geq 2$, both sides in (A.26) are equal to zero, we thus just need to consider the case $x < 2$. First, since $\mathcal{X}$ is a proper subset of $\mathcal{P}_0(\mathbb{R})$,

$$K(x) \leq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty,x])} I(\mu). \tag{A.27}$$

Next, we need to prove

$$K(x) \geq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty,x])} I(\mu). \tag{A.28}$$

From Theorem 1.10 and Theorem 1.11 of Chapter IV in [27], we know that there is a unique probability measure, call it μ_0, which minimizes $I(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0((-\infty, x])$, and the support of μ_0 is an interval, denoted as $[a, b]$ (with $b \leq x$). Since μ_0 is atomless, its distribution function F is continuous, increasing with $F(a) = 0$ and $F(b) = 1$. Moreover, since μ_0 has zero mean, $\int_0^1 F^{-1}(x)dx = 0$, where F^{-1}, the inverse of F, is continuous and increasing on $[0, 1]$, with $F^{-1}(0) = a$ and $F^{-1}(1) = b$.

Now for any integer $n \geq 2$, construct an approximation to F^{-1} as follows: for $i/n \leq x \leq (i + 1)/n$, let

$$G_n^+(x) = \begin{cases} n\left(F^{-1}(\frac{i+2}{n})\left(x - \frac{i}{n}\right) + F^{-1}(\frac{i+1}{n})\left(\frac{i+1}{n} - x\right)\right), & \text{if } 0 \leq i \leq n-2, \\ b + x - \frac{i}{n}, & \text{if } i = n-1, \end{cases}$$

and let

$$G_n^-(x) = \begin{cases} n\left(F^{-1}(\frac{i}{n})\left(x - \frac{i}{n}\right) + F^{-1}(\frac{i-1}{n})\left(\frac{i+1}{n} - x\right)\right), & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n-1, \\ a + x - \frac{i+1}{n}, & \text{if } i = 0. \end{cases}$$

From this construction, $\int_0^1 G_n^+(x)dx > 0$ and $\int_0^1 G_n^-(x)dx < 0$. Next, let

$$\gamma_n^+ = \frac{-\int_0^1 G_n^-(x)dx}{\int_0^1 G_n^+(x)dx - \int_0^1 G_n^-(x)dx}, \ \gamma_n^- = \frac{\int_0^1 G_n^+(x)dx}{\int_0^1 G_n^+(x)dx - \int_0^1 G_n^-(x)dx},$$

and let

$$G_n(x) = \gamma_n^+ G_n^+(x) + \gamma_n^- G_n^-(x).$$

Then,

$$\int_0^1 G_n(x)dx = 0,$$

and since G_n is piecewisely linear, it is Lipschitz continuous. Let μ_n be the probability measure whose distribution function is the inverse function of G_n, the Lipschitz continuity of G_n yields that $\mu_n \in \mathcal{X}$, for any $n \geq 2$. From its construction, we know that μ_n is supported on $[a - 1/n, b + 1/n]$, and μ_n converges to μ_0 weakly as n goes to infinity, thus

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int x^2 d\mu_n(x) = \int x^2 d\mu_0(x). \tag{A.29}$$

For the second term on the right side of (A.5),

$$\iint \log|x-y|d\mu(x)d\mu(y) = 2\iint_{x<y} \log(y-x)d\mu(x)d\mu(y), \tag{A.30}$$

let

$$\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i<j}\log\left(F^{-1}\left(\frac{j+1}{n}\right)-F^{-1}\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{2n^2}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\log\left(F^{-1}\left(\frac{i+1}{n}\right)-F^{-1}\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right) \tag{A.31}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i<j}\log\left(G_n\left(\frac{j+1}{n}\right)-G_n\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{2n^2}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\log\left(G_n\left(\frac{i+1}{n}\right)-G_n\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right) \tag{A.32}$$

be Riemann sum approximations of $\iint_{x<y}\log(y-x)d\mu_0(x)d\mu_0(y)$ and $\iint_{x<y}\log(y-x)d\mu_n(x)d\mu_n(y)$ respectively. For any $i \le j$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\log\left(G_n\left(\frac{j+1}{n}\right)-G_n\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right)\\ &\ge \gamma_n^+\log\left(G_n^+\left(\frac{j+1}{n}\right)-G_n^+\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right)+\gamma_n^-\log\left(G_n^-\left(\frac{j+1}{n}\right)-G_n^-\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right),\end{aligned} \tag{A.33}$$

and moreover, for any $1 \le i \le j \le n-2$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\log\left(G_n\left(\frac{j+1}{n}\right)-G_n\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right)\\ &\ge \gamma_n^+\log\left(F^{-1}\left(\frac{j+2}{n}\right)-F^{-1}\left(\frac{i+1}{n}\right)\right)+\gamma_n^-\log\left(F^{-1}\left(\frac{j}{n}\right)-F^{-1}\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{A.34}$$

If $\iint_{x<y}\log(y-x)d\mu_0(x)d\mu_0(y) = -\infty$, (A.28) is trivially true, so assume this integral is finite. Moreover, since $\gamma_n^+ + \gamma_n^- = 1$,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\left(-\iint \log|x-y|d\mu_n(x)d\mu_n(y)\right) \le -\iint \log|x-y|d\mu_0(x)d\mu_0(y), \tag{A.35}$$

and combining (A.29) and (A.35), gives

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} I(\mu_n) \le I(\mu_0).$$

Since μ_n is supported on $[a-1/n, b+1/n]$ and from the right continuity with respect to x of $\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty,x])} I(\mu)$, we know that

$$K(x) \ge \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}((-\infty,x])} I(\mu),$$

which finishes the proof. ■

To finish, we obtain the large deviations for the first r eigenvalues of the traceless GUE when at least one of them is on the left of the asymptotic mean:

Corollary A.1 *For $x_r \leq x_{r-1} \leq \cdots \leq x_1$, and $x_r \leq 2$, we have*

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m^2} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\xi_1^{m,0} \leq x_1, \cdots, \xi_r^{m,0} \leq x_r\right) = -K(x_r),$$

Proof. Since $(\xi_1^{m,0}, \xi_2^{m,0}, \cdots, \xi_m^{m,0})$ is the nonincreasing rearrangement of $(\xi_1^0, \xi_2^0, \cdots, \xi_m^0)$, set

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \mathbb{P}\left(\xi_1^{m,0} \leq x_1, \cdots, \xi_r^{m,0} \leq x_r\right), \\ B &:= \mathbb{P}\left(\xi_1^0 \leq x_1, \cdots, \xi_r^0 \leq x_r, \xi_{r+1}^0 \leq x_r, \cdots, \xi_m^0 \leq x_r\right), \end{aligned}$$

then

$$B \leq A \leq \frac{m!}{(m-r+1)!(r-1)!} B \leq m^r B. \tag{A.36}$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m^2} \log A = \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m^2} \log B. \tag{A.37}$$

Changing variables:

$$\xi_i^0 - (x_i - x_r) = \eta_i, \quad \text{for} \ \ 1 \leq i \leq r-1,$$

$$\xi_i^0 = \eta_i, \quad \text{for} \ \ r \leq i \leq m,$$

we then have:

$$B = \mathbb{P}\left(\eta_i \leq x_r, \ 1 \leq i \leq m\right).$$

Considering the two measures $\frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i^0$ and $\frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i$, for any bounded and Lipschitz function g, we have

$$\frac{1}{m}\left|\sum_{i=1}^m g(\xi_i^0) - \sum_{i=1}^m g(\eta_i)\right| \leq \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m |\xi_i^0 - \eta_i| \to 0, \quad \text{as} \ \ m \to \infty$$

so $\frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i^0$ and $\frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i$ are exponentially equivalent, and Theorem A.2 also applies for the latter (see Theorem 4.2.13 in [11]). So from (A.25), we have

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m^2} \log B = -K(x_r),$$

and (A.37) finishes the proof. ■

Acknowledgments. Many thanks to Satya Majumdar for suggesting that the methods of [25] should give the closed form expression for the rate function obtained in Theorem 1.2, and to Ionel Popescu for his help with Lemma A.1 and its proof.

References

[1] G. Aubrun. *An inequality about the largest eigenvalue of a random matrix.* Séminaire de Probabilités XXXVIII 320-337. Lecture Notes in Math. 1857. Springer, Berlin, 2005.

[2] A. Auffinger, G. Ben Arous and J. Cerny. *Random matrices and complexity of spin glasses.* ArXiv: 1003.1129, 2010.

[3] G. W. Anderson, A. Guionnet and O. Zeitouni. *An Introduction to random matrices.* Cambridge University Press, 2010.

[4] J. Baik, T. Suidan. *A GUE central limit theorem and universality of directed first and last passage percolation site.* Int. Math. Res. Not. no. 6, pp. 325-337, 2005.

[5] Y. Baryshnikov. *GUEs and Queues.* Probab. Theor. and Relat. Fields, vol. 119, pp. 256-274, 2001.

[6] G. Ben Arous, A. Dembo and A. Guionnet. *Aging of spherical spin glasses.* Probab. Theory Related Fields 120, no. 1, 1-67, 2001.

[7] G. Ben Arous, A. Guionnet. *Large deviations for Wigner's law and Voiculescu's non-commutative entropy.* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields, 108, 517-542, 1997.

[8] T. Bodineau, J. Martin. *A universality property for last-passage percolation paths close to the axis.* Elect. Comm. Probab. vol. 10, pp. 105-112, 2005.

[9] J.-C. Breton, C. Houdré. *Asymptotics for random Young diagrams when the word length and alphabet size simultaneously grow to infinity.* Bernoulli. 16, 471-492, 2010.

[10] D. S. Dean, S. N. Majumdar. *Large deviations of extreme eigenvalues of random matrices.* Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, no. 16, 160210, 4pp, 2006.

[11] A. Dembo, O. Zeitouni. *Large deviations techniques and applications.* 2nd ed. New York , Springer, 1998.

[12] J.-D. Deuschel, O. Zeitouni. *On increasing subsequences of I.I.D. samples.* Combin. Probab. Comput. 8(3), 247-263, 1999.

[13] J. Gravner, C. Tracy and H. Widom. *Limit theorems for height fluctuations in a class of discrete space and time growth models.* J. Stat. Phys., vol. 102 nos 5-6, pp. 1085-1132, 2001.

[14] C. Houdré, T. Litherland. *On the longest increasing subsequence for finite and countable alphabets.* High Dimensional Probability V: The Luminy Volume, IMS Collections 185-212, 2009.

[15] C. Houdré, T. Litherland. *On the limiting shape of Young diagrams associated with Markovian random words.* Preprint 2011.

[16] C. Houdré, H. Xu. *On the limiting shape of random Young tableaux associated to inhomogeneous words.* Preprint arXiv: 0901.4138, 2009.

[17] J-P. Ibrahim. *Large deviations for directed percolation on a thin rectangle.* Accepted at ESAIM P&S.

[18] K. Johansson. *Shape fluctuation and random matrices.* Comm. Math. Phys. 209, 437-476, 2000.

[19] K. Johansson. *Discrete polynomials ensembles and the Plancherel measure.* Ann. Math. vol. 153, pp. 259-296, 2001.

[20] M. Ledoux, B. Rider. *Small deviations for beta ensembles.* Preprint, 2010.

[21] M. Lifshits. *Lecture notes on strong approximation.* Pub. IRMA Lille 53 13, 2000.

[22] M. Löwe, F. Merkl. *Moderate deviations for longest increasing subsequences: the upper tail.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 54, no. 12, 1488-1520, 2001.

[23] M. Löwe, F. Merkl and S. Rolles. *Moderate deviations for longest increasing subsequences: the lower tail.* J. Theoret. Probab. 15, no. 4, 1031–1047, 2002.

[24] M. L. Mehta. *Random matrices. 3nd ed.* Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, 2004.

[25] C. Nadal, S. N. Majumdar, M. Vergassola. *Statistical distribution of quantum entanglement for a random bipartite state.* J. Stat. Phys. 142, no.2, 403-438, 2011.

[26] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex analysis.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.

[27] E. B. Saff, V. Totik. *Logarithmic potentials with external fields.* Springer, Berlin, 1997.

[28] T. Seppäläinen. *Large deviations for increasing sequences on the plane.* Probab. Theory Related Fields 112(2), 221-244, 1998.

[29] C. Tracy, H. Widom. *Level-spacing distributions and the Airy kernel.* Commun. Math. Phys., vol. 159, pp. 151-174, 1994.

[30] C. Tracy, H. Widom. *On the distribution of the length of the longest monotone subsequences in random word.* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields, vol. 119, pp. 350-380, 2001.

[31] C. Tracy, H. Widom. *Matrix kernels for the Gaussian orthogonal and symplectic ensembles.* Annales de l'institut Fourier, 55 no. 6, p. 2197-2207, 2005.

[32] F. G. Tricomi. *Integral equations.* Pure Appl. Math., vol. V. Interscience, London, 1957.